DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 038 555 AA 000 540

AUTHOR	Robinson, Lora H.; Shoenfeld, Janet D.
TITLE	Student Participation in Academic Governance. PREP-15.
INSTITUTION	ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. National Center for Educational Communication.
REPORT NO	PREP-15
PUB DATE	Jun 70
NOTE	67p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.45
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Freedom, *Activism, Administrator Attitudes, Annotated Bibliographies, *Governance, *Policy Formation, *Student Participation
IDENTIFIERS	*Putting Research into Educational Practice (PREP)

ABSTRACT

PREP-15, a review and annotated bibliography, focuses on the topic of "Student Participation in Academic Governance." A related document compiled by the authors at the ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education is ED 038 786. This is the first PREP presentation of material from an ERIC Clearinghouse product and it is anticipated that similar products will be used as future PREP material. This kit of six documents deals with the topic of student participation: (1) Survey of Current Practices and Policies; (2) Survey of Attitudes; (3) Arguments For, Against, and About Student Participation; (4) Models of Governance; (5) Methods of Increasing Student Involvement; and (6) Institutional Proposals for New Governance Structures. A seventh document includes a listing by university and state of recent changes in governance. This PREP kit is available from EDRS. (LS)

ED 038 555

AA 000 540

PREP

putting
research
into
educational
practice

PROBLEM ► RESEARCH ►

INTERPRETIVE REPORTS OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Enclosed are specially designed materials on a topic of current interest to educators. The purpose of the materials, produced under U.S. Office of Education contracts, is to bring research and development findings to bear on the practical problems of educators.

Because OE is able to produce only a limited number of copies, the materials are designed so that educators can easily and inexpensively reproduce or adapt them to meet local needs, and distribute them in their educational communities. Other studies are being supported on problems now facing school personnel. As materials from these studies become available, they will be disseminated in the same manner.

EVALUATION ► PRACTICE

Effective dissemination, especially of research and development findings, can be a powerful force in advancing the cause of education. To facilitate communication between the researcher in the laboratory and the educator in the classroom, the Bureau of Research has inaugurated a special report service. These reports, prepared under USOE contracts, are interpretations of educational research and development directed at solutions to problems faced by the Nation's schools. Many State agencies and other groups concerned with education are participating in this service by repackaging and disseminating the reports to meet the needs of their local school districts. The cooperating agencies have been selected because of their strategic position in the educational community. Through this joint effort the Bureau of Research hopes to strengthen State and local educational information services and to speed the adoption of tested educational innovations.

putting
research
into
educational
practice

PREP PREP PREP BRIEF

STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN ACADEMIC GOVERNANCE

Status of Student Power

"The question is no longer whether, but how; no longer how far, but how fast...."

The proponents of student power far outnumber the opponents, but sharp differences arise over the question of the limits of student influence.

Differences Over Student Participation in Academic Governance

Definition of "Participation"--Students tend to regard participation as the sharing of authority with faculty and administrators, whereas faculty and administrators view student participation as advising or recommending.

Extent of Participation--Student membership on academic committees or other governing bodies is a recent but widespread phenomenon. However, student influence has been largely confined to nonacademic matters in which students traditionally have some voice. Research shows that students still have little decisionmaking responsibility in such areas as curriculum planning, faculty selection, admissions, college fiscal policies, or general institutional planning.

Critics and Advocates of Student Power--Who They Are, How They Differ

Critics oppose significant student participation, contending that students are transients, inexperienced, and incompetent.

Advocates argue that colleges can benefit from the student's unique viewpoint and that participation nurtures the student's personal and intellectual growth.

One advocate insists that a correlation can be made between the amount of student influence and the quality of the institution; that students have more influence at the good schools than they have at mediocre schools.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE / Office of Education

National Center for Educational Communication

Within the university framework--

Trustees, not surprisingly, express the greatest resistance to change in the governing process.

Faculty, more surprisingly, rank as the next most conservative faction; they are especially hesitant to extend student authority into those areas that they have traditionally controlled. Whereas most faculty members believe that students should formulate social regulations and make their ideas heard in other areas, they would give students little or no formal control over the curriculum, degree requirements, and faculty evaluation.

Administrators reveal themselves as sympathetic toward student demands. They are not only receptive to student demands for a broader role, but have actively instigated wider student involvement in governance.

Future of Academic Governance

Proposals for models of academic governance entail development of broad governmental structures that foster a sense of community. Proposals reject the practice of electing a few students who supposedly serve as representatives for the entire student body--instead of institutionwide systems to encourage student and faculty participation.

Some researchers say that universities no longer have the choice of rejecting student participation. They must make their systems of governance more democratic or risk mounting disruption.

For More Information

A review and annotated bibliography of current research on the topic "Student Participation in Academic Governance" has recently been compiled by Lora H. Robinson and Janet D. Shoenfeld of the ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, Washington, D.C. The document is available from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (ED 035 786, MF-$0.25; HC-$1.50), National Cash Register Company, 4936 Fairmont Avenue, Bethesda, Maryland 20014.

A PREP kit--No. 15--also deals with this topic. In six documents the kit presents brief discussions and bibliographic annotations on surveys of current practices and policies; surveys of attitudes; arguments for, against, and about increasing student participation; models of governance; methods of increasing student involvement; and institutional proposals to increase involvement or establish new governance structures. A seventh document includes a listing by university and State of recent changes in governance. The PREP material will also be available from EDRS.

PREP

NO. 15

PREP is . . .

- *a synthesis and interpretation of research, development, and current practice on a specific educational topic*
- *a method of getting significant R&D findings to the practitioner quickly*
- *the best thinking of researchers interpreted by specialists in simple language*
- *the focus of research on current educational problems*
- *a format which can be easily and inexpensively reproduced for wide distribution*
- *raw material in the public domain which can be adapted to meet local needs*
- *an attempt to improve our Nation's schools through research*
- P *utting*
  R *esearch into*
  E *ducational*
  P *ractice*

STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN ACADEMIC GOVERNANCE

Student demands for greater participation in academic governance have produced changes on hundreds of American campuses. The cause of "student power" unites students otherwise divided by ideological differences. In a June 1969 Gallup Poll, 81 percent of the college students polled indicated their feeling that students should have a greater say in the running of colleges. They were not alone. Administrators, faculty, outside observers, and public officials have themselves applied increasing pressure for greater student involvement within the last few years.

In the literature, the proponents of student power far outnumber the opponents, and arguments based on some combination of morality and expediency are generally used to justify their position. Sharp differences arise, though, over the question of the limits of student influence. While many academicians are willing to agree to some redistribution of authority, most are certainly not ready to embrace the concept of the university as a democracy. Nevertheless, student pressures toward this end are likely to continue. According to Edward Schwartz (1969), former president of the U.S. National Student Association:

> *The question is no longer whether, but how; no longer how far, but how fast; and these depend, essentially, upon the ability of an old order to move, to change, and to grow.*

A review and annotated bibliography focusing on the question of the nature and extent of existing and contemplated levels of student participation in college and university governance has recently been prepared by Lora H. Robinson and Janet D. Shoenfeld of the ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, Washington, D.C. This is the first time PREP has presented material from an ERIC Clearinghouse product. More products of the ERIC Clearinghouses will probably be used as future PREP material.

National Center for Educational Communication/ OFFICE OF EDUCATION

PREP kit No. 15 deals with the topic in seven documents:

- Survey of Current Practices and Policies - No. 15-A
- Survey of Attitudes--Trustees, Administrators, Faculty, and Students - No. 15-B
- Arguments For, Against, and About Student Participation - No. 15-C
- Models of Governance - No. 15-D
- Methods of Increasing Student Involvement - No. 15-E
- Institutional Proposals for New Governance Structures - No. 15-F
- Recent Changes in Governance (Three Sections - Addition of Students to Existing Bodies, Formation of New Committees, New Structures) - No. 15-G

The format of Nos. 15-A through 15-F includes brief topic discussions followed by references and annotations. No. 15-G categorizes institutions by State, alphabetically, under each of the three sections having to do with "Recent Changes in Governance."

PREP

SURVEYS OF CURRENT PRACTICES AND POLICIES

NO. 15-A

Research surveys on student participation in academic governance have usually tried to determine what current practices and policies are, or have assessed a particular group's attitudes toward the decisionmaking role of students. Some studies attempt to link the two ("Governing a College," 1969)* or relate current levels of student involvement to the nature of the institution (Hodgkinson, 1970).

Generally, the surveys indicate that student membership on academic committees or other governing bodies is a recent but widespread phenomenon (*Constructive Changes;* Davis, 1969). The kinds of changes that are increasing student control over university policy are almost as numerous as the institutions reporting them and few regional differences can be found (Muston, 1969). It is clear, however, that student influence is largely confined to nonacademic matters in which students have traditionally had some voice. Researchers agree that students still have little decisionmaking responsibility in such areas as curriculum planning, faculty selection, admissions, college fiscal policies, or general institutional planning.

Benovich, Joseph B., and others. (See document No. 15-F)

Carr, Alden J. *Student Participation in College Policy Determination and Administration.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Study Series No. 4, 1959.

This study reports the findings obtained from a questionnaire returned by 109 institutions belonging to the AACTE on the areas in which students participate in determining general policy and the channels through which this participation takes place. Respondents indicated the extent and value of present and probable future levels of student participation. Generally, it was felt that participation should be increased, but that it should be accompanied by adequate evaluation. A short historical section and recommendations are also included. Although this study is dated, it is worth mentioning because of its systematic approach.

Constructive Changes To Ease Campus Tensions. Washington, D.C.: Office of Instructional Research, National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, 1968. (*Research in Education,* ED 035 384, MF - 50¢, HC - $3.10).

---

*Bibliographic data and abstracts of cited documents follow the brief reviews in each PREP document.

National Center for Educational Communication/ OFFICE OF EDUCATION

This compilation documents steps taken by approximately 90 percent of the State universities and land-grant colleges to involve students in governance and to develop policies and procedures aimed at handling disruption. Part I, dealing with student participation in university policymaking, is subdivided into: participation in governance, membership on committees, participation on search and screening committees, self-studies and evaluations, communication and cònsultation with students, involvement with boards of trustees, ombudsmen, and adoption of student suggestions. Part II contains policies on obstruction and disruption, student codes, preparedness for disruption, policies and practices regarding police, and policies on firearms. The survey strongly indicates that universities have "been making diligent efforts to deal with legitimate concerns."

Davis, John B., Jr. "A Survey of Practices Related to Student Membership on Academic Committees," Greenville, N.C.: Faculty Senate Committee on Committees, East Carolina University, 1969, (*Research in Education*, ED 032 855, MF - 25¢, HC - $1.40).

This study identifies current practices of institutions concerning student membership in academic committees and in certain other university governing bodies. A questionnaire was sent to 85 schools, and 49 were returned. Major conclusions were: (1) more than three-fourths of the schools had a policy that provided for student membership on some academic committee; (2) such membership was a recent development, usually initiated by the administration; (3) qualifications for student membership varied, but it was generally required that the student be an elected, full-time upperclassman; (4) contributions made by student members were considered significant by most schools; (5) student membership was more common on committees associated with activities that were primarily student-oriented than on those that were primarily faculty-oriented; (6) no regional differences were found.

"Governing A College: How Much Should Students Have To Say?" *College Management* 4, 1969, pp. 53-54.

The views of 212 deans of students were obtained on several aspects of student participation in decisionmaking. Responses to each question were tabulated for the total and by type of institution: university, 4-year, and 2-year colleges. The results give a good picture of the amount of participation students now have and in which of eight areas: clubs, dormitory rules, discipline, curriculum, faculty appointment, admissions, endowment use, and selection of a president. It was found that students have the least to say about faculty appointments, admissions, endowment use, and selection of a president. For the same eight areas, deans indicated whether the current voting power of students was "too little," "enough" or "too much." About one-half believed that current student participation was too low. Sixty-five percent reported appeals for a larger role in governance at their institutions. Sixty-one percent believed that student members of governing bodies were as responsible as the regular members. The faculty was seen as most resistant to change. Although the results of this survey are based on less than one-half of the total sample, similar trends were found in later responses.

Hodgkinson, Harold L. "Student Protest - An Institutional and National Profile," *Teachers College Record,* February 1970.

The purpose of this study was to identify the characteristics that distinguish institutions reporting increased student protest from those which do not. Among many variables examined in a sample of 1,230 institutions was the effect of a strong student voice in institutionwide policy. The hypothesis that increased student control over institutional policy would result in a decrease in student protest was not supported by the data.

Lunn, Harry H., Jr. *The Students's Role in College Policy Making.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, Commission on Student Personnel. 1957.

This book is largely a descriptive report emphasizing specific examples of different forms of student involvement in administration and policy formation. It is an important source in the study of this topic as a social movement.

Main, Jeremy. "The 'Square' Universities Are Rolling, Too," *Fortune* 79, January 1969, pp. 104 ff.

This is a general article about the current expansion of student involvement into a wide range of university affairs. The author makes distinctions among the types of involvement according to the levels at which participation takes place. One level is that of student affairs in which students are self-governing, e.g., in dormitories. Another is that of the joint committee (student-faculty or student-administrator) concerned with housekeeping matters, such as parking. The third is that of the joint committee which deals with educational policy such as curriculum and tenure--the heart of university policymaking.

Muston, Ray A. "Governance Changes Are Catching Colleges By Surprise: A National Survey shows," *College and University Business* 47, July 1969, pp. 29-31.

Of 1,769 institutions surveyed for significant changes in governance during 1968, it is not clear how many institutions reported changes. The data were analyzed by type of control, regional accreditation, State, enrollment, level of degree programs, types of academic programs, and board size. They revealed that the most frequent means of involving both faculty and students was through increasing membership on standing and advisory committees. Other types of change are listed in order of the frequency of occurrence, but their frequency is not given. The author notes that the kinds of change reported were almost as numerous as the institutions reporting them.

PREP

NO. 15-B

SURVEYS OF ATTITUDES--TRUSTEES, ADMINISTRATORS, FACULTY, AND STUDENTS

Samples of all factions--trustees, administrators, faculty, and students--have been asked for their opinions on an expanded student role in governance. They have usually also been asked to indicate in which areas, if any, they would condone or favor greater student involvement.

Of all groups, trustees express the greatest resistance to change in the governance process. Asked whether they, administrators, faculty, or students should be responsible for deciding policy in 16 areas of governance (Harnett, 1969), trustees indicated a definite preference for a "top-down" form of government. Even in deciding such an issue as the choice of a speaker for commencement--a student-centered event--only 20 percent would give a major role to students.

The faculty emerges as the next most conservative faction, especially when it comes to extending student authority into areas they have traditionally controlled. The attitudes of faculty members basically determine the effectiveness of student participation in academic policymaking (Aceto, 1968; Boren, 1966), for most of the changes sought by students must be approved and accommodated by the faculty. Researchers agree (Milton 1968; Wilson and Gaff, 1969) that, whereas most faculty members believe that students should formulate social regulations and make their ideas heard in other areas, they would give students little or no formal control over the curriculum, degree requirements, and faculty evaluation. Because faculty members are in daily contact with students and are empowered to regulate their academic progress through grades, faculty opposition to an expanded student role often represents a major obstacle. Footlick (1967; see document 15-C) predicts that over future confrontations governance will be between students and faculty.

Administrators appear to be sympathetic toward student demands. A survey of 212 deans ("Governing a College") revealed that the respondents thought administrators were not only receptive to student demands for a broader role but they actively instigated wider student involvement in governance. Sixty-five percent indicated that students should participate in administrative and academic affairs as voting members, while 28 percent favored an advisory role. These affirmative opinions are echoed in Milton's and Orcutt's (1969) studies.

National Center for Educational Communication/ OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Few surveys have attempted to define the areas or means of increased student participation that would broadly be acceptable to students, faculty, and administrators. Although some sampling has been done at individual institutions in the process of changing their governance structure, it is rarely reported formally. One study that compares responses of students, faculty, *and* administrators on the desired extent of student involvement in various aspects of policy formation was conducted by Hekhuis (1967) who surveyed representatives of six groups at Michigan State University. He found that "participation" meant different things to different groups. Students tended to regard participation as the sharing of authority with faculty and administrators, whereas faculty members and administrators viewed student participation as advising or recommending. Again, administrators were more favorably disposed toward student involvement than were the faculty. Most administrative and faculty support for student participation (defined as advising) was in the area of student personnel administration. The faculty indicated considerable reluctance to include students in general institutional and academic administration.

Aceto, Thomas D. "Student Participation in Policy Making and the Use of Direct Action at the Mid-West Committee on Institutional Cooperation Universities." Ph.D. dissertation, Syracuse University, 1967.

This study is based on structured interviews with 66 people from 11 universities. The persons interviewed included the dean of students, chapter president of the American Association of University Professors, student government president, chapter president of Associated Women Students, the student newspaper editor, and the chapter president of the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). The author cites four major conclusions: (1) only a small minority of students want to take over the university; (2) extensive disagreement exists between deans of students and the SDS, especially on the use of direct action; (3) increased student participation in policymaking can be effected only to the extent that it is welcomed by the faculty and administration in fact as well as theory; (4) nonobstructive direct action is acceptable, although it is not necessarily the preferred tactic used to initiate or change policy on the university campus.

Boren, James E. "Cooperative Government at the University of Minnesota," *Role and Structure of Student Government*. Edited by Mary Meehan. Washington, D.C.: U.S. National Student Association, 1966.

This article contains the conclusions and recommendations of a master's thesis on student involvement in policymaking at the University of Minnesota. Student representatives on faculty committees filled out questionnaires and committee chairmen were interviewed. It was found that the attitude of the faculty chairman often determined the effectiveness of student participation; student participants believed the experience was valuable; students believed their committee service had improved university-student relationships and communication; and students and faculty became better acquainted. Most of the recommendations were directed to the specific situation at the University of Minnesota.

"Governing Boards: Trustees Strive To Close Generation Gap--But Not by Opening Board to Students," *College and University Business* 47, April 1969, p. 24.

Trustees from 10 universities comment on their relationship to the students in their institutions. The general consensus is that: times are changing, a trustee's role is changing, and students should not be represented on governing boards. There is no identification of what a "new" role or "new" demands will entail.

"Governing a College ...." (See document No. 15-A)

Hartnett, Rodney T. *College and University Trustees: Their Backgrounds, Roles and Educational Attitudes*. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1969.

This study investigated the trustee's background and other personal characteristics, his attitudes toward current higher education issues, and his duties and responsibilities as a trustee. Trustees were asked who should have the major responsibility for deciding 16 campus issues, such as: course or program changes, student housing, presidential appointment, tenure decisions, student cheating, admission criteria, and fraternities and sororities.

The author draws three major conclusions: "First, trustees generally favor a hierarchical system in which decisions are made at the top and passed down . . . Over 50 percent of the total sample of trustees believe that faculty and students should not have major authority in half of the 16 decisions listed." Second, trustees distinguish among the kinds of decisions for which they would allocate responsibility to other groups. Third, although they generally prefer an arrangement in which the faculty and students do not have major authority, they do not want to "rule" by themselves.

Hekhuis, Louis Frederick. "A Comparison of the Perceptions of Students and Faculty at Michigan State University With Respect to Student Participation in University Policy Formulation." Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1967.

Representatives from six groups at Michigan State University--student nonleaders, student leaders, faculty nonleaders, faculty leaders, academic administrators, and student personnel administrators--were asked to rate the extent to which they thought students should be involved in various aspects of university policymaking. In most areas, policy formulation was not perceived as the sole prerogative of any group.

Hodgkinson, Harold L. *Student Participation in Campus Governance*. A paper presented at the AERA Conference, Los Angeles, California, 1969, *(Research in Education,* ED 034 478, MF - 25¢, HC - $0.40).

This discussion of the student's role in governance is based on the results of a questionnaire administered to 3,000 persons on 19 campuses and on more than 900 interviews. A great deal of variety in the patterns of student participation, both quantitatively and qualitatively, was found. There were three kinds of responses: (1) student participation was favored in the belief that better decisions would result; (2) students had been included in governance to "take the heat off"; and (3) administrators believed that students should have no say, while the faculty sympathized with the administrators and students simultaneously.

Sometimes more responsibility was offered than students were willing to accept; other times there was a lag between the granting of more power to students and a corresponding increase in respect for their ability and responsiblity. Most resistance was expressed to student participation in faculty promotion and retention and in curriculum matters.

The results seem positive on campuses which have had students participating for more than 2 years, although student participation has not proved a panacea for problems of campus unrest. On large campuses there is a special problem, because no one student representative can draw loyalty from the entire constituency. Hodgkinson believes that students are needed to improve the quality of campus decision-making because they are more concerned about the quality of teaching than are either the faculty or administrators.

Milton, Ohmer. *Survey of Faculty Views on Student Participation in Decision Making. (Research in Education,* ED 024 332, MF - 25¢, HC - $1.85).

"The major purpose of this investigation was to explore faculty attitudes or opinions about student involvement in determining cogent campus policies...." An interview approach was utilized. The schedule was designed to provide quantitative and qualitative data: each respondent could answer "yes," "no," or "don't know" and then qualify his remarks in any manner desired. Eight areas of decision-making were covered: student discipline, evaluation of teachers, academic calendar arrangements, curriculum planning, degree requirements, grading systems, faculty governing boards, and legal governing boards. Three other questions were included in an effort to determine how respondents viewed students, how they perceived the teaching-learning process, and the extent to which they had thought about the latter in depth. A randomly selected sample of full-time faculty members was interviewed at six schools (mostly in Tennessee). Some administrators were also interviewed, and their responses were compared with those of the faculty.

Generally administrators would allow more student participation than faculty. Faculty members (1) agreed that students should participate extensively in determining nonacademic policies; (2) thought that students should participate in evaluating teachers, but that survey results should be shared only with the teacher; (3) rejected student participation in affairs of the governing board; (4) believed that student ideas should be obtained, though there was no consensus on how; (5) tended to be conventional in their thinking about teaching-learning issues in general.

Orcutt, John. "How Deans and Students See It," *Focus on Action: A Handbook for Developing Junior Colleges.* Edited by Selden Menefee and John Orcutt, Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, May 1969.

This report of an opinion poll concerns the rights and responsibilities of students in junior colleges. A dean and a student responded at each of 12 colleges. One section inquired about the extent to which students should be involved in 22 areas of governance. Student participation was never ruled out entirely by a majority of the respondents. The most frequently endorsed response was "some student involvement." This was true for such items as: faculty appointment, allocation of instructional funds, administrative structure of the college, curriculum, staff salaries, teaching loads, selection of the president, and provision of services to the community, in addition to areas of traditional student involvement. Although there is no indication of how students should be involved, the poll does provide one of the strongest endorsements of student involvement in governance to be found.

Student Power at the University of Massachusetts. A Case Study. Amherst: University of Massachusetts, April 1969, (*Research in Education,* ED 834 492, MF - 50¢, HC - $3.70).

This essay, describing events surrounding a student demonstration at the University of Massachusetts, provides an understanding of the mechanics by which the confrontation came into being, and analyzes relevant opinions and attitudes of students. In 1968, the university's student majority supported radical student leaders in a tactical switch from Vietnam-related issues to others concerning student power. But when the radicals made subsequent demands for change "right now" in the entire administrative structure of the university the student majority reacted negatively. A sample survey of the student body revealed widely held feelings of discontent with certain aspects of university life, but not a desire to overthrow the university administration. A survey conducted a year later showed that student opinion had shifted toward greater support of student power and black issues, and that there was a close connection between new left positions and black power advocacy. Student power and new left positions were related to age, sex, class, major, and membership in conventional student groups, but advocacy of black power was not. The conclusion of the study is that, if there continues to be a wide gap between the radical leadership and a student-government oriented "left wing" of the student body, the prospect is for changes in university policy but little or no challenge to the university's administrative structure.

"Why Students Act That Way - A Gallup Study," *U.S. News and World Report 66*, June 2, 1969, pp. 34-35.

In April and May 1969, 1,030 youths in 55 colleges were interviewed about current issues by the Gallup Poll. Three questions pertained to student involvement in decisionmaking. It was reported that 81 percent of the total believed that students should have a greater say in running colleges; 75 percent said that students should have greater influence over the academic realm of college life; 42 percent believed the student protestors' biggest complaint was "not enough say in the running of colleges."

The poll gives an up-to-date look at the priorities of student concern in college governance.

Wilson, Robert C., and Gaff, Jerry G. "Student Voice--Faculty Response," *The Research Reporter* 4, Berkeley, California: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, 1969, pp. 1-4, (*Research in Education*, ED 034 503, MF - 25¢, HC - $0.30).

As part of a study of faculty characteristics and their influence on students, questionnaires covering a wide variety of faculty attitudes, values, and behavior were sent to over 1,500 professors at six diverse colleges and universities. For this report, data were drawn from those collected on faculty attitudes toward student participation in campus governance. While the 1,069 responding faculty were generally favorable toward student participation in the formulation of social rules, they were reluctant to share their academic power with the students. Ninety-five professors thought that students should have an equal vote with the faculty on academic matters (equal vote group) and 41 others felt that students should have no role in the formulation of academic policy (no vote group). The remaining faculty fell between these two extremes. Responses of the "extreme" groups were related to their educational philosophies, conceptions of and extracurricular contact with students, fields of study, political orientation, and involvement in campus affairs. The equal vote group had a liberal view of society and life and a positive view of students; the no vote group was basically conservative and tended to believe that external control, motivation, and direction were needed in order for students to profit maximally from their education.

PREP

NO. 15-C

ARGUMENTS FOR, AGAINST, AND ABOUT INCREASING STUDENT PARTICIPATION

Although all writing on the topic of student involvement in governance includes some rationale for the author's position or explanation of purpose, this document contains articles that focus on the philosophical and/or political arguments favoring or opposing an expanded student role. This approach to the subject is an extremely popular one and the advocates--at least in the literature--outnumber the opponents. Critics generally oppose significant student participation in academic policymaking on the grounds that students are transients, inexperienced, and incompetent. Advocates argue that colleges can benefit from the student's unique viewpoint and that participation nurtures the student's personal and intellectual growth. Although most writers urge universities to give more responsibility to students, they would generally confine the scope of their responsibility to nonacademic matters.

Auerbach, Carl A. "Memo to the Members of the University Faculty on the Subject of the Task Force Recommendations on Student Representation in the University Senate and Campus Assemblies," Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, February 24, 1969, (*Research in Education*, ED 028 729, MF -25¢, HC - $0.75).

This memorandum sets forth reasons why the author thinks the proposed university constitutional changes should not be adopted (see *Report of the University of Minnesota*, document 15-F) and suggests certain alternatives. He argues that students should be heard not represented, for they have no persuasive claim to be permitted to vote on matters that will have an impact long after they graduate. He suggests a structure of university government and he divides decisionmaking functions into three categories--those on which students vote alone, those on which students and faculty have an equal vote, and those on which faculty vote alone.

Bloustein, Edward J. "The New Student and His Role in American Colleges," *Liberal Education* 54, October 1968, pp. 345-364.

This paper inquires into the reasons for and the nature of the student assertion of a right to share in the management of the American college and university. The author describes the classical American college and contrasts it with today's institutions. He then

National Center for Educational Communication/ **OFFICE OF EDUCATION**

details how the emergence of the "new student" may be traced from weaknesses in each of the characteristic elements of the classical college system - the hierarchical structure of authority, the fixed and ordered system of certain knowledge, a rigidly defined and severely limited set of educational functions, and a completely paternalistic relationship between the student and the college.

Brunson, May A. "Student Involvement in University Governance: Sense or Nonsense?" *Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors* 32, Summer 1969, pp. 169-175.

The author lists several of the traditional arguments against student involvement such as immaturity, transiency, lack of legal responsibility, and apathy--and then refutes each one. She feels that a major factor affecting the type of involvement is institutional size. She advocates student participation, arguing that the institution should be viewed as a community including the students; students have potential for making worthwhile contributions; and the experience offers training for leadership and is good for student morale. She then lists some approaches to student participation which have been taken by various institutions.

Committee on the Student in Higher Education. *The Student in Higher Education.* New Haven, Conn: Hazen Foundation, January 1968.

This report concerns the quality of student life in the broadest sense and an assessment of the treatment of students as governance participants. The committee concluded that students are permitted little real involvement in planning their own education or in shaping the campus environment. Most institutions tacitly assume that students are "simple minded savages" who must be excluded from real governance because they are not mature enough to be trusted with responsibility. The committee recommended increased student participation in educational policymaking and student representation at the highest levels.

"Conversations," *Student Participation in University Decisions: Where Are We, Where Are We Going in the Student Movement?* Philadelphia: ARA-Slater School and College Services, 1969.

This report consists of a roundtable discussion among three students and two college administrators on the topic of student participation in university decisions. Each spoke from his experience at a particular institution; and since experiences varied, few generalizations could be made. The group did seem to agree that student involvement is on the increase and that, in general, when students were involved, the experience was good. There was some discrepancy about the tactics students or administrators should use. The administrators preferred limited student participation -- such as consultation only in some instances -- whereas the students saw no limit to the kinds of university activities in which they could be involved.

Desmond, Richard. "Faculty and Student Frustrations Shaping the Future of the University," *AAUP Bulletin* 55, March 1969, pp. 23-26.

The author calls for the faculty and administration to encourage meaningful student participation in academic governance. He believes that crises can be averted by sharing the decisionmaking with students. He sees students as the only group with enough to gain to risk the dangers of making demands for change.

Footlick, Jerrold K. "A Testing by Protest," *The College Scene Now*. Silver Spring, Md: Dow Jones and Company, Inc., 1967.

The author presents some of the arguments for and against student involvement in governance, commenting on the current and predicting the future status of the student movement. "A correlation can be made between the amount of student influence and the quality of the institution; students have more influence, generally, at the good schools than they have at mediocre ones." He reasons that this is because the faculty and administration at better institutions realize more quickly the value of student concern. For the future, he predicts a student-faculty confrontation.

Frankel, Charles. "Student Power: The Rhetoric and The Possibilities," *Saturday Review* 51, November 2, 1968, pp. 23-25.

This article is a general essay on the topic of student involvement in governance. The author discusses the ramifications of the use of slogans and phrases common to the movement, and relates how students have influenced the evolution of educational theory and practice in the past. Now the question is not whether students have the right to say something, but whether it would be educationally desirable to create arrangements permitting a more visible and formal participation in the making of academic decisions. He feels that, if people have some power over the way in which they live and work, they will have more interest in their experiences, learn more from them, and tend to become more responsible. Nevertheless, the author would limit student power and would not approve of student involvement in faculty selection and retention.

"Governing a College: The Pros and Cons of Student Involvement," *College Management* 4, May 1969, pp. 40-44.

Two faculty members from the University of Delaware debate the role students should play in the selection and retention of faculty, curriculum decisions, and choosing a president.

Hodgkinson, Harold L. "Students and An Intellectual Community," *Educational Record* 49, Fall 1968, pp. 398-406.

In this article the author touches on the topic of student participation in governance. He believes that the view that students are well equipped in terms both of competence and longevity on campus to participate meaningfully in academic governance has more validity than customarily assumed. He supports his contention by comparing the campus adults' way of life to that of the students'. He claims that the notion of "readiness" is used to hold students back, whereas there is evidence that 5- and 6-year-olds are able to build their own curriculum in a disciplined way.

Kerlinger, Fred N. "Student Participation in University Educational Decision Making," *Teachers College Record* 70, October 1968, pp. 45-51.

This author opposes giving students university or college decision-making power. He bases his stand on three criteria--legitimacy, responsibility and competence--and explains how their application would disqualify students from areas of governance. If students were allowed to vote, he says, the result would be both a weakening of the educational program and a change in the nature and purpose of the university.

Leadership and Responsibility on the Changing Campus: Who's in Charge Here? Washington, D.C.: American Association of State Colleges and Universities, November 1968.

This work contains 18 speeches presented at the 8th annual meeting of the Association. Several are on the subject of student involvement in governance.

Lewis F. Powell, Jr., dealing with current problems of administrators, says students should have a voice, but not to the degree students in South American universities have. He believes it would be irresponsible to allow this to happen, mainly because students are transient.

John J. Corson in "From Authority to Leadership" (ED 024 336, MF - $0.25, HC - $1.10) views the problem as political in the sense that it is a matter of redistributing authority among the faculty members, president, trustees, students, alumni, and administration. The current distribution of authority according to presumptions inherited from the liberal arts college of a century ago makes no sense for the large multifunction university of today.

D. W. Halladay, Joseph Kauffman, and Richard Skutt discuss "The Role of the Student" (ED 029 605, MF - $0.25, HC - $0.70). Halladay considers students' "legitimate" demands - those concerned with the quality of the educational experience as they reasonably pertain to the stated objectives and resources of the institution. Such demands include: the faculty's disaffection from the basic function of good teaching, the teaching and counseling relationship between teacher and student, the relevance of subject matter, the conduct of registration, the rigid and limited requirements of some major courses of study, and the replacement of the professor by the graduate assistant.

Kauffman relates some of the conflicting traditions of the American university to present contradictory pressures. He believes that a developmental approach toward student participation in governance should be taken. Therefore, the first order of business is to improve human relationships within the college.

Skutt lists three ways in which the students' role in the university should develop: acquisition of self-governance, recognition by the faculty and administration of the student's right to participate in matters affecting his life, and establishment of the cooperative institution -- a true community of scholars. He sees no reason why the control and regulation of student governments and student court systems cannot be entirely in the hands of students. In the realm of academics, students and faculty should work together.

Macneil, Ian. "The President's Commission on Student Involvement in Decisionmaking. A Comment." Mimeographed. 1969. (*Research in Education*, ED 034 502, MF - 25¢, HC - $1.60).

Based on the premise that intellectual liberty must permeate every aspect of university life, this comment is directed to individuals at Cornell University who do not understand the processes, restraints, and techniques required to preserve academic freedom. It focuses exclusively on relationships between student involvement in decisionmaking and intellectual liberty; and suggests that, before any significant change is allowed to take place, the impact of such change on academic freedom should be considered. Increased student involvement is discussed in the context of nonacademic matters, teaching, scholarship, and research.

Marchese, Theordore J. "Student Participation in Plans Is No Longer a Question of Whether, But How? *College and University Business* 47, August 1969, pp. 37-38.

This article makes a strong plea for genuinely involving students in governance. The author lists two main reasons for his stance: (1) it would be a means of improving the range and quality of advice while enlarging and enriching the input into the planning process, and (2) the experience would also provide maximum opportunity for student growth and fulfillment. He points out practices in the past which have belied the significance of involvement. Involvement implies more than having two students attend a monthly planning meeting: "the planner-educator needs to sense that student participation has to be practically on student terms."

Martin, Warren Bryan. "Student Participation in Academic Governance," *Current Issues in Higher Education*. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1967.

As a rationale for his approval of substantive student participation in academic policy formation and institutional governance, the author lists and then refutes the arguments usually given by the opposition: (1) Students are immature and lack the experience needed for such responsibility. But, as consumers, students can contribute a unique view of the classroom and educational process. (2) Students have only a short-term affiliation with the school, thus their loyalty toward it is limited. But, the average tenure of college and university presidents is about 4 years, and the faculty value job mobility and their professional guilds above their institutions. (3) If students can do a better job than the faculty, they ought to be doing the teaching. This reaction is extreme; there is no evidence that more than a tiny minority of students want to take over the university, the classroom, or anywhere else.

The author discusses the reasons why the prospects for significant student participation are poor and challenges colleges and universities to become organized into tripartite communities in which faculty, administrators, and students all share in forming and implementing policy. He outlines the framework of a proposed universitywide council.

McDonough, John R. "The Role of Students in Governing the University," *AGB Reports* 10, April, 1968, pp. 24-31.

This author opposes extending student participation in college and university decisionmaking, arguing that it should not be a democratic process. He draws an analogy between a hospital and the university. Patients do not manage the hospital. The student's position is that of a patron or consumer who can discontinue his patronage or go elsewhere.

The author does say that students have the right to be heard. But even granting this much complicates the governance process because students think problems are urgent, new students have to be continually filled in on the issues, and students do not have to live with the decisions which are made. He then discusses the committee of fifteen established at Stanford to discuss university problems and policies with the power only to make recommendations.

McGehee, Nan E. "Faculty and Students, or Faculty Versus Students." Mimeographed. 1969. (*Research in Education*, ED 034 511, MF - 25¢, HC - 50¢).

In an attempt to discover why students are demanding participation in the decisionmaking processes of the university, the author examines four of the most common issues they have raised: (1) student conduct codes and disciplinary procedures, areas in which modern college students reject institutional authority; (2) a voice in the hiring, promotion, and dismissal of faculty, and sometimes administrators; (3) curriculum planning--a major concern is for the relevance of undergraduate education to students' needs, goals, and lives; and (4) admissions and graduation requirements, grades, and other matters leading to certification. Because students and faculty are more heterogeneous than before, more aware of social issues, and less patient with the slow academic pace, institutional goals should be revised. Conflicts seem to stem, the author argues, from differing perceptions of university goals.

Morision, Robert S. (See document 15-F)

Morris, Arval A. "Student Participation in University Decision Making." Mimeographed. 1969. (*Research in Education*, ED 031 141, MF - 25¢, HC - 25¢).

This article generally opposes extending student participation to governance. The assumptions of those demanding a voice are considered and refuted. For example, the author states that a democracy is an inappropriate model for the university community because its members are not of equal status, and it is unclear who is a member of the community and who is not. He believes that, if students are let in, others will also want a voice; and if a voice is given, then students will want votes in proportion to their numbers in the university. He argues that decisions should be made on the basis of competence, thus eliminating students from curricular decisions. The author says students should be heard in these matters and suggests holding one or two annual meetings with the entire student body. He justifies student control of nonacademic policy on the basis that such concerns are related to their private lives.

"Student Participation in University Government." Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1968. A study paper prepared for the Committee of Presidents of Universities of Ontario by its Subcommittee on Research and Planning.

This report presents the rationale for student involvement in governance in terms of the university's nature and goals. The advantages and disadvantages of student membership on supreme governing bodies are outlined.

Vaccaro, Louis C., and Covert, James T., eds. *Student Freedom*. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1969.

This collection of essays provides background information which helps explain the demands of student activists for "on the one hand, increased influence in areas of policy formation hitherto controlled by faculty or administration; on the other hand . . .a lessening of the bonds of authority that have traditionally governed their personal lives." Although all of the articles, in their consideration of the negative and positive implications of growing student freedom, are generally concerned with participation in governance, only one is specifically directed toward the topic. Theodore N. Farris, in his article "Social Role Limitations of the Student as an Apprentice," develops the analogy of the student as an apprentice and the teacher as a master. While he urges faculty members and administrators to heed and assist "responsible student opinion," he warns against granting "the more radical demands of the students for university control."

Wilson, Logan. "Protest Politics and Campus Reform," *Administrative Law Review* 21, November 1968, pp. 45-64, (*Research in Education*, ED 028 696, MF - 25¢, HC - $1.15).

The author believes it has been increasingly evident that significant numbers of students are profoundly dissatisfied with the status quo, on as well as off the campus, and many are ready to use force and violence to change it. In some instances student activists want more participation in decisionmaking, and in others they seek complete control. The organized black students generally use power tactics to gain concessions for themselves rather than to effect drastic alterations in college structure and function. Despite the ends sought by some of these groups and the use of confrontation tactics, some of the protest reflects legitimate concerns. Instead of adopting an authoritarian posture, it would seem more sensible to acknowledge the presence of student activists, keep their protest within reasonable bounds, and take a hard look at what forms of "participatory democracy" are compatible with the institution's central purpose. For whatever the nature and purposes of the university may be, order on the campus is a necessity, and responsibility for maintaining it must be shared by all members of the campus community. Institutions should be prepared to make functional and structural changes, but it should be emphasized that they exist to serve the larger society rather than to further demands of the moment on their campuses. The kind and degree of participation should depend upon individual capability.

Wofford, Harris. "New and Old Actors in Institutional Decision Making." *Current Campus Issues*. Cambridge, Mass.: University Consultants, Inc., 1969.

An account of the birth and development of the State University of New York at Old Westbury is presented by its founding president Harris Wofford. Intended as an experimental institution that would admit students as "full partners" in the academic world, Old Westbury underwent a stormy but not unsuccessful first year as a result of conflicting interpretations of full partnership.

PREP

MODELS OF GOVERNANCE

NO. 15-D

These articles contain suggestions for new structures incorporating student membership. Models proposed for specific institutions are included in document 15-F. Most of the proposals reject the practice of electing a few students who supposedly serve as representatives for the entire student body, and instead recommend the establishment of institutionwide systems that would encourage widespread student and faculty participation. Alexander (1969), for example, suggests the creation of a student parliament made up of one representative for each 20 student petitioners and directly responsible to the university president. Hodgkinson (1968) calls for an "electronic town meeting" at which campus decisions are made on an ad hoc basis by all those concerned with a particular issue. Shoben (1969) proposes a bicameral system of faculty and students. Representatives would be selected from districts within the college community on the basis of common interests. He argues that this form of governance would be more organically related to the community as a whole. Hallberg (1969) also favors an all-college government. All of these proposals entail the development of broad governmental structures that foster a sense of community.

Alexander, William M. "Rethinking Student Government for Larger Universities," *Journal of Higher Education* 40, January 1969, pp. 39-46.

The author suggests a unique form of student government and outlines some of its features. The representatives to a student parliament would be selected by petition on a ratio of one representative to 20 petitioners. A cabinet would be elected from the parliament to prepare the parliamentary agenda. The parliament would meet 2 hours per week and would be directly responsible to the university president.

Auerback, Carl A. (See document 15-C)

Duster, Troy. "Student Interests, Student Power, and the Swedish Experience," *The American Behavioral Scientist* 11, May 1968, pp. 21-27.

This author takes a sociological approach to the topic of student participation in college and university governance. He suggests looking at the nature of rewards for the three groups--faculty, administration, and students. If differences are found, there would be justification for representation of each group in a governing council. He goes on to describe the student role in governance at Swedish universities and suggests adopting the kinds of structural devices which would most suit institutional governance here.

National Center for Educational Communication/OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Hallberg, Edmond C. "An Academic Congress: A Direction in University Governance," *Phi Delta Kappan* 50, May 1969, pp. 538-540.

The author believes that students can and should participate in college and university governance. He proposes that a governmental form grow out of the mutual needs and purposes expressed by those governed. This long proposed concept is impossible to realize under the present system of governance. The author sees three governmental alternatives for the future: (1) students will find a place as "necessary" representatives in faculty governance as it now exists, (2) each power group will retain a separate organization and vie for power, or (3) an all-college government will be formed. The author advocates and discusses the third possibility.

Henderson, Algo D. "The Administrator/Student Conflict," *Administrative Law Review* 21, November 1968, pp. 65-77,(*Research in Education*, ED 028 696, MF - 25¢, HC - $1.15).

The author discusses various changes in higher education in terms of organizational theory. One such current change concerns the growing inclusion of students in governance. "The authoritarian and bureaucratic modes of administration that prevail among universities are not appropriate for an academic setting. The modern concept of group participation should be adopted. Administrators generally are ignorant of organizational theory and take for granted the existing structures and practices." Although faculty and administrators are resisting the movement toward participation of all members of the campus community, he thinks that students have a significant contribution to make. And since they intend to be heard, involvement should be provided to prevent recurring crises. Students are right in calling student governments "Mickey Mouse" since their sphere of responsibility is nonacademic and their authority is usually limited. Modern organizational theory using the group participative model conceives of decisionmaking as a processs that involves those affected by the decisions in relation to the degree of their interest.

Hodgkinson, Harold L. (See document 15-E)

Martin, Warren Bryan. (See document 15-C)

Shoben, Edward Joseph, Jr. "Student and University Governance: A Preliminary Sketch." Mimeographed. 1969. *(Research in Education*, ED 031 138, MF - 25¢, HC - 50¢).

New governance structures must allow for personalized forms of representation if we assume that (1) extensive participation by students in governance is a modern necessity and likely to be a permanent feature, (2) participation legitimately represents student concerns and provides a channel through which student contributions can be realized, and (3) construction of suitable machinery for greater participation is the only process by which students can become fully committed members of the academic community. This means the political process must be associated with individuals who have distinctive names and faces. Present-day institutions have lost their "rootedness" in the community in which they operate, resulting in the restlessness of today.

The author goes on to describe a form of governance having several unique features designed to make the process of academic government more organically related to the community. It is a bicameral system of faculty and students, with the student assembly the lower house. The two houses would be connected by familiar machinery such as joint commissions, and the houses would have the power to initiate all bills pertaining to certain areas. Academic credit, and possibly stipends, would be given to student assemblymen. Representatives would mean a very different university, but a better one.

PREP

NO. 15-E

METHODS OF INCREASING STUDENT INVOLVEMENT

Much of the literature deals with the practical aspects of the topic. Here, guidelines and specific examples are offered for institutions and students interested in an expanded student role in governance. They range from prescriptions by university presidents (Heffner, 1968; *Who's in Charge*, 1969) for the correct administrative stance to hard-hitting papers by students (Powell, 1970; Schwartz, 1969; Werdell, 1969) that come to terms with the levels of participation and the areas in which students have been, can be, or should be involved.

Generally, it is in these papers that the rationale for involving students in governance is carefully developed. But the authors go beyond rhetoric to describe either how institutions have responded to student demands or outline ways they could if they chose to do so. The implication throughout is that universities no longer have the choice of rejecting student participation. They must make their systems of governance more democratic or risk mounting disruption. "At the heart of student militancy, then, is the question of the proper decisionmaking role of the student within our institutions of higher education" (Johnstone, 1969).

Benovich, Joseph B., and others. (See document 15-F)

Bowles, W. Donald. "Student Participation in Academic Governance," *Educational Record* 49, Summer 1968, pp. 257-262,

This author discusses the power structure of higher education institutions and suggests how students who wish to achieve real influence should approach the task. Basically, his prescription is to keep in mind how academic governance actually does take place, not how it should take place. This necessitates identifying the mainsprings of power in a given institution in order to determine where to begin. The department is named as a likely target. The author suggests ways students might make themselves more acceptable to the powers that be.

Although it is not uncommon to find sympathizers for the student power movement among administrators, it is rare to find one who describes methods for obtaining influence.

Frick, Ivan E. "Reflections on Participatory Democracy," *Liberal Education* 60, May 1969, pp. 262-271.

National Center for Educational Communication/OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Although this article focuses primarily on faculty participation in college affairs, students are mentioned. Based on both his own experience and an institutional self-study at Findlay College (Ohio), the author lists six principles for aiding participants in governance: (1) grasp the nature of the college as a community; (2) create, understand, and accept both general goals and specific objectives; (3) become more knowledgeable about the sociology of higher education; (4) understand that hostility and conflict are generated within the college community; (5) understand that each member of the total community has his own role; and (6) understand that participation takes time.

Heffner, Ray L. "The Student Voice in Institutional Policy," *AGB Reports* 10, February 1968, pp. 3-10.

Speaking from his experience as president of Brown University (Rhode Island), the author discusses the role of the president in current times. He gives some of the history of Brown and relates it to current concerns. He also relates how Brown's regulations on student conduct were modified. His three prescriptions for institutional progress are: (1) enunciate institutional goals and seek understanding and acceptance by all elements of the academic community, (2) accept students as junior partners in the enterprise, (3) provide alternatives in which experimental approaches can develop so that components of the community, such as the students, are not faced with the choice of either accepting or rejecting the "system."

Hodgkinson, Harold L. *Governance and Factions--Who Decides Who Decides?* Berkeley, California: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, July 1968 *(Research in Education*, ED 025 208, MF - 25¢, HC - 30¢).

Hodgkinson argues that student government presidents are criticized by students for being pawns of the administration and playing "sandbox government." In fact, almost all factions involved in campus governance seem to feel caught in the middle, unable to act freely, hemmed in by others, by outworn procedures and "arrangements of convenience." But, although most people appear to dislike governance, they seem to feel that they are the only people qualified to undertake it.

Hodgkinson suggests three ways to improve campus governance, but notes their potential drawbacks: (1) set up a campuswide governing body composed of representatives of all factions, although there is a decline in belief in the idea of representative government; (2) give campus administrators more power than they now possess although many think they are already too powerful; and (3) make decisions on a nonrepresentative, ad hoc basis, by all of those concerned about any particular issue, although our institutions may be far too large to allow such a system to work.

"Issues in University Governance," A Report to the Ford Foundation on the Summer Colloquium on University Governance. New York: Institute of Higher Education, Department of Higher and Adult Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, September 1968 *(Research in Education,* ED 028 700, MF - 25¢, HC - $2.85).

This publication contains summaries of the speeches made during a 5-week colloquium. "The purpose of the colloquium was to identify more specifically the governmental issues that universities in the U.S. now face and to bring to bear on these issues scholarship from relevant fields and the views of both specialists and students . . . to derive a better understanding of the forces presently at work in institutions of higher education, to accurately identify and define critical issues, and when feasible, to propose solutions or to determine next steps to be taken in seeking solutions if further evidence is required."

In "Students' Stake in Academic Governance," Franklin Littell gives reasons why students' frustration and protest are rising, and calls for changes in university governance toward a more democratic model incorporating a system of checks and balances.

In "Changing Concepts of Student Citizenship in the Contemporary University," Alan Westin argues that student citizenship now implies participation and due process. Participation is defined as "a process of sharing information, providing structures for debate and discussion, and relying on various modes or procedures for securing its assets from those persons who are part of an institution and whose rights and interests will be affected by decisions which that institution makes." He calls for participation of students in the entire range of university planning, including the nature of university expansion, choice of fund-raising philosophy, structure and process of education, and the role of the university in the larger community. Estin says that an institution needs to provide (1) certain basic experiences and knowledge for its members so that their decisions can be informed and meaningful, and (2) alternate structures and processes since all its members are not alike.

In "Academic Government: Participants and Structures," W. H. Crowley argues that all nine interest groups having influence on institutions of higher learning have a basic right to participate in the governance of the university. Regarding student participation, he suggests adopting the Scottish pattern in which students elect an adult representative to the governing board. He also feels that students should serve on various institutional committees and make recommendations about the institution.

Carl Davidson, in "The Student and The University," is against the notion of students co-managing the affairs of the university because students then manage an oppressive system with the oppressors.

Johnstone, Bruce D. "The Student and His Power," *Journal of Higher Education* 40, March 1969, pp. 205-218.

The author discusses six methods of exercising informal, indirect or lower level student power which would bring the total student body into an effective decisionmaking role. He feels that such mechanisms "constitute a far more fruitful approach to the entire set of issues concerning student power than do the traditional models of formal student government and joint governing committees."

Students can attain power through (1) lower level planning, such as the joint planning of individual courses (this would involve students in departmental and divisional policymaking); (2) individual programs, such as credit by examination, independent study, and individualized programing (this would transfer power from faculty to students); (3) indications of consumer preference; (4) involvement in the faculty reward system, such as publishing, course and teacher evaluations, and compelling faculty to prepare students for externally administered examinations; (5) the exposure of alternatives in experimental colleges; and (6) the expression of dissent, such as lobbying, ad hoc committees, and underground publications.

Since the "disenchanted" perceive themselves as unable to influence events and unable to gain respectful recognition, the heart of student discontent is the proper decisionmaking role of college students. The author discusses the limitations of various traditional mechanisms of participation, such as communications channels, student councils, and joint committees.

Joughin, Louis. "The Role of the Student in College and University Government," *Symposium on Academic Freedom and Responsibility*. Los Angeles: California State College, May 22, 1968, *(Research in Education*, ED 034 479) MF - 25¢, HC - 50¢).

The author believes that, if an institution of higher education is to function, it is necessary that all components--trustees, administration, faculty, and students--fulfill their responsibilities. Students have a responsibility for self-development which they cannot fulfill unless they are allowed certain rights and freedoms. To facilitate their development institutions should (1) provide for more information exchange, (2) consult with students, and (3) give students some decisionmaking responsibility for some areas of student life. As "consumers" of institutional services, students should be heard on all academic matters that concern them. The proper student role in nonacademic life is difficult to discover, but a good beginning can be made in intensive cooperative study--such as that undertaken at Brown University. A great deal of misunderstanding between students and the local community might be avoided by instituting channels of communication. The author says there is no group better qualified to improve the colleges and universities than the students in them.

Leadership and Responsibility on the Changing Campus (See document 15-C, the paragraph on Richard Skutt's article.)

Mitau, Theodore. "Student Participation in Campus Government," St. Cloud, Minnesota: St. Cloud College, February 18, 1969, *(Research in Education*, ED 029 563, MF - 25¢, HC - 55¢).

The author calls for student participation in all university decisions affecting students' personal lives, their curriculums, and campus environment. He feels that participatory campus democracy will have to come in order for colleges and universities to continue to be viable and dynamic. Campuses are political institutions which means there must be an accommodation of diverse viewpoints in their governance. He suggests three ways to help the governance process. Each campus should have an up-to-date table of organization indicating major decisionmaking agencies and their chief personnel. Every student leader should have a clear understanding of his campus organization so he can explain to fellow students how problems are processed through various administrative agencies. Students should be informed continually and respectfully on the progress of their suggestions, requests, and petitions through the decisionmaking machinery.

Ostar, Allan W., and Otten, Jane. "Fresh Developments at State Higher Education Institutions," *School and Society* 96, January 20, 1968. pp. 48-50.

This article gives specific examples of steps taken to deal with student complaints concerning lack of communication with the faculty and administration and insufficient participation in establishing school policy. Cases are cited of student representation on key faculty and administrative committees.

Powell, Robert S., Jr., "Participation Is Learning," *Saturday Review* 53, January 10, 1970, p. 56ff.

The subject of the 12th annual symposium cosponsored by the *Saturday Review* and the Committee for Economic Development was "Who Runs the University?" Most of the material presented at the meeting is included in this issue. The student's perspective is provided by Robert Powell, past president of the U.S. National Student Association. He argues that student power is aimed at changing the undemocratic character of universities, and describes steps that must be taken to enable students to take responsibility for their own learning. Most important, the current grading system must be abolished and the monopoly of faculty power over key academic decisions broken. Many examples of how students can help to shape university policies are given.

"Proposed Alterations in the Governance of the University," Stanford, California: American Association of University Professors, Stanford University Chapter, October 3, 1968, (*Research in Education*, ED 035 355, MF - 25¢, HC - $1.45). The resolutions for change, which are accompanied by discussion and which were accepted by the Stanford chapter of the A.A.U.P., deal with: the board of trustees, appointment of administrative officers, discussion of university issues, faculty and student participation in decisionmaking, the student role in governance, crisis handling, financial matters, protection of personal privacy, and the implications for the university of external social pressures. Almost all of them refer to expanded student involvement.

Proposed Codes with Commentary: Student Conduct and Discipline Proceedings in a University Setting. New York: New York University School of Law, August 1968, (*Research in Education*, ED 033 671, MF - 25¢, HC - $2).

This report grew out of a research seminar, whose purpose was "to develop a basic rationale for university regulation of student conduct that would allow students as much freedom as possible in the pursuit of their educational objectives." Student participation in the decisionmaking process is covered under the discussion of student rights and responsibilities. The report suggests that the role of student government be made explicit and its actions final, students be given final authority in decisions affecting their personal lives, and student advice be heard in the area of educational policy. The group also suggests that the university could increase student participation in governance by increasing the autonomy of student organizations, creating faculty-student committees to consider policies affecting student life, selecting a faculty ombudsman, and conducting a faculty evaluation survey.

Richardson, Richard C., Jr. "Recommendations on Student Rights and Freedoms: Some Procedural Considerations for the Two-Year College," *Junior College Journal* 39, February 1969, pp. 34-44.

This author calls for a commitment by administrators to student involvement in governance to the extent that it is feasible given students' level of experience and maturity. He then identifies areas in which students should and should not be involved. He gives them a primary role only in areas of traditional student concerns.

Schwartz, Edward. *Joint Statement on the Academic Freedom of Students. A Summary and Analysis.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. National Student Association, 1967. (*Research in Education,* ED 034 498,MF - 50¢, HC - $3.50).

This booklet contains the *Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students* which was adopted by the American Association of University Professors, the Association of American Colleges, the U.S. National Student Association, the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, and the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors. It recommends that students be allowed to participate in formulating and implementing policy; express their views freely in the classroom and in student publications; and join organizations to promote their interests. The *Statement* also proposes revision of admissions policies to ensure equal access to higher education. A lengthy section deals with procedures for administering student discipline; separation of students' academic and disciplinary records is advocated. The American Council on Education's statement on the confidentiality of student records is included.

Schwartz, Edward, ed. *Student Power. A Collection of Readings.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. National Student Association, January 1969.

"This anthology has several purposes. First, it seeks to make available . . .a number of scattered essays written by students which . . .provide an extended definition of 'student power.' Second, it draws attention to some of the specific proposals recently advanced for incorporating students into the campus decisionmaking process. Third, it examines several campus confrontations in considerable detail in order to provide tactical perspectives on the movement and, hopefully, to distill some collective wisdom from these experiences."

Joel R. Kramer, in "What Student Power Means," presents a student's view. He states that, as long as students have no legitimate democratic voice, protest will continue. He justifies making the university a democracy and says that, although there is no consensus on this issue, students are willing to fight for it and, therefore, administrators must deal with the reality of the situation. The administrators' choice is to give in on matters they are unsure of or to repress disruptions in the name of law and order. He goes on to discuss the kind of university that students would design. Its governance structure would include student participation in general university and curriculum policymaking and exclusive student control of the extracurricular domain.

In "Student Power," Henry Mayer is generally against complete independence for any one segment of a campus population. He calls for a collective, open decisionmaking process that affords all members genuine participation. "Student power inescapably means shared power. No question of genuine significance . . .can be decided by students alone...." He opposes the practice of "plugging" students into the existing system instead of developing new governance structures.

Excerpts from *The Culture of the University: Governance and Education* (see Foote, document 15-F) discuss increased student participation in the governance of Berkeley; and excerpts from *The Crow Report,* by the ad hoc committee on the role of students in the government of the Madison Campus, University of Wisconsin, include the committee's recommendations and guidelines for implementation. (see Ad Hoc Committee, document 15-F.)

Edward Schwartz believes the demand for student power begins only after students become dissatisfied with university policy and trust has broken down. In "Student Power--In Response to the Questions," he points out that all factions in the university argue in favor of student power. When students challenge the authority of a particular group, however, they are labeled "rash, immature, transient, inexperienced, and incompetent" by that group. Schwartz discusses why students want more say about parietal rules, the curriculum, the quality of teaching, and university priorities. He views the student power movement as more concerned with the questions of "What kind of rule?" and "What are the qualities of human rule" than with "Who rules?"

Schwebel, Robert. "Wakening Our Sleepy Universities: Student Involvement in Curriculum Change," *Teachers College Record* 70, October 1968, pp. 31-34.

This article describes specific examples of student involvement in producing curriculum changes both from within and outside the governmental structure. The author notes that the most widespread form of student involvement in educational policymaking has been student attendance at meetings of curriculum and academic committees.

Sparzo, Frank J. "Facing the Issues of Student Unrest," *School and Society* 96, October 26, 1968, pp. 359-361.

The author views students as the "fourth estate" because they have gained power. He believes that the issue to be resolved is not whether students should have power, but in what areas. Areas for participation should be selected according to their contribution to the students' education and personal growth. A major problem is that neither the institution nor the students really know or agree upon what areas these are.

Werdell, Philip P. "An Open Letter to Educators on Student Participation in Decision Making." Washington, D.C.: U.S. National Student Association, 1968.

The mimeographed open letter to educators links the crisis in U.S. cities (Black Power) with the crisis in the universities (Student Power). "...the quality of student experience in universities today will play a powerful and perhaps determining role in the quality of life in our cities for decades to come. The central issue is effective student participation in decisonmaking in the university - in policy formation and implementation." The author, one of the architects of the student educational reform movement, describes the new student culture and discusses at length 12 examples of student-initiated changes in the universities: the Joint Statement on Student Rights and Freedoms; course and teacher evaluations; student-faculty-administration retreats; free universities and student experimental colleges; learning and living residences; community governments like Antioch, Reed, Maryville, New Rochelle, and Old Westbury; curricular changes motivated by black and other minority student demands; action curriculums, (e.g., the accreditation of off-campus experiences); co-operative governments; the January Plan; student development programs; and alternatives to the grading system. Some unique suggestions are offered for educators interested in participating in an "experimental action curriculum" aimed at learning about the needs and talents of their students.

Who's in Charge? Baltimore, Maryland: Editorial Projects for Education, A Moonshooter Report, 1969, (*Research in Education,* ED 035 357, MF - 25¢, HC - 80¢).

This report outlines the roles and problems of college trustees, presidents, faculty, and students in governing their institutions. The main topic discussed is the burgeoning power of students and the differing aims of some of the major student organizations. The article emphasizes that factions must find ways to work together as a community to preserve academic freedom and avoid the total destruction of the university. The influences of the public, the alumni, and the Federal Government are considered. The report notes that increasing numbers of institutions have devised, or are seeking, ways to make students an integral part of the campus decisionmaking process. It includes some suggestions of President Kingman Brewster (Yale University) for peaceful student involvement: (1) Free expression must be "absolutely guaranteed, no matter how critical or demonstrative it may be." (2) Students must have an opportunity to take part in "the shaping and direction of the programs, activities, and regulations which affect them." (3) Channels of communication must be kept open. "The freedom of student expression must be matched by a willingness to listen seriously." (4) The student must be treated as an individual with "considerable latitude to design his own program and way of life."

PREP

NO. 15-F

INSTITUTIONAL PROPOSALS TO INCREASE STUDENT INVOLVEMENT OR ESTABLISH NEW GOVERNANCE STRUCTURES

All of the speeches, case studies, committee and task force reports, constitutions and bylaws in the document are concerned with proposed or recently implemented changes in governance at specific institutions. The 35 colleges and universities include large, prestigious, small, unknown, public, and private institutions in every section of the country. In order to formalize student participation at all levels, most of them have completely restructured their systems of governance and many have rewritten their constitutions.

A major impetus for reorganizing governmental structures has been the realization that the informality of old patterns of decisionmaking has contributed to undemocratic and inefficient government. The growth experienced at many small colleges in recent years has especially strained traditional "family affair" methods of governance. By clearly defining the authority of various groups or positions, planners hope to identify the avenues for participation in campus decisions and bring about more responsive systems.

The four major recommendations of the ad hoc committee on the role of students in the government of the University of Wisconsin are representative of the kinds of changes being considered and undertaken on many campuses. The committee advocates (1) practically complete withdrawal by the university from its *in loco parentis* activities; (2) broader student participation of various forms in practically all areas of university government; (3) greater student self-governing authority, reduced areas and forms of direct faculty and administration supervision, and simpler means of liaison between students and faculty; and (4) restructured, limited, and clarified university disciplinary procedures.

Some of the reports describe the processes of governmental reorganization (Jenks, 1969a; Smith, 1969); others deal with the societal as well as internal pressures for specific reforms. President Homer D. Babbidge (1969) of the University of Connecticut suggests that the people of Connecticut join with all constituents of the university community in design-

National Center for Educational Communication/ OFFICE OF EDUCATION

ing a charter or constitution for the university. Usually, it is evident that colleges have made some effort to evaluate the policies of other institutions before revising their own. Cleveland State University (Benovich, 1969), for example, surveyed 66 other schools in order to find out what their policies on student participation were. Another approach is that of President Harris Wofford (1969) who reflects on a year of "full partnership" with students at SUNY, Old Westbury.

Without knowing the specific character of each institution--particularly, where the power lies--it is difficult to estimate the significance of each of these administrative or legislative reforms. On some campuses, the inclusion of a few students in the academic senate has been accomplished only after months of work and turmoil, representing a substantial victory for the students and their backers. On others, the announced assignment of students to disciplinary committees may only formalize a longstanding practice. Nevertheless, the number and variety of reported changes in governance procedures, the range of institutions at which they are occurring, and the ingenuity of many of the proposals certainly indicate that efforts to share authority with students are underway and growing.

Ad Hoc Committee on the Role of Students in the Government of the University. "Report to the University Committee." Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1968, (*Research in Education,* ED 035 383, MF - 25¢, HC - $2.95).

This report (The Crow Report) examines past policies and practices regarding student participation in governing the University of Wisconsin, and recommends 17 structural and functional changes aimed at increasing student authority. The proposals would release the university from all *in loco parentis* activities, compel all committees to review their policies on student membership, and considerably simplify disciplinary procedures.

Babbidge, Homer D., Jr. *Eighth Annual Faculty Convocation.* Storrs: University of Connecticut, November 6, 1969, (*Research in Education*, ED 035 354, MF - 25¢, HC - 75¢).

In this address, the president of the University of Connecticut reviews a number of important issues on his campus. He discusses a recent "separatist" move of the student senate to assume control of the dormitories. "The alternative to student separation is, of course, more effective and powerful student participation in some form of community government based on a recognition of common interests and the legitimacy of each one's interest in the affairs of all." Rejecting the notion of a separate student government, he urges adoption of a unicameral governing body and a major overhaul of the existing governmental structure to make it more responsive to members of the academic community. He argues that the people of Connecticut (because they "have paid for and own all of our academic facilities") deserve to participate in designing a charter or constitution for the university. He suggests that a constitutional convention be convened and that, later, the board of trustees assume the role of supreme court charged with ensuring that the actions of everyone involved in

institutional legislative or executive policy are in accordance with the constitution.

Benovich, Joseph B., and others. *Report of the President's Committee on Student Involvement in the University*. Cleveland, Ohio: Cleveland State University, May 16, 1969, (*Research in Education*, ED 035-360, MF - 25¢ HC - $1.80).

Originally established to consider expanded faculty and student involvement in the governance of Cleveland State University (Ohio), the committee decided to concentrate on matters of student participation. It also decided to recommend changes within the existing governmental structure rather than encourage establishment of a new structure. Background material was studied, meetings were held, and two questionnaires were administered--one to deans, departmental chairmen and various other academic units at Cleveland State, and another to 66 universities asking for information on student involvement in governance at their institutions. The responses to the second questionnaire are tabulated in the report. All of the universities indicated they were "rethinking" or had recently revised their policies on student involvement in governance. Brief explanations of their reasons for doing so are offered. Recommendations of the committee call for student membership on 17 university committees and representation at departmental meetings. Recommendations also specify the number of students to be included on each committee, method of selection, academic qualifications necessary, and terms of appointment.

Blair, Carolyn L. *All-college Council at Maryville College*. Maryville, Tennessee: Maryville College, 1969, (*Research in Education*, ED 034 508, MF - 25¢, HC - 35¢).

In May 1968, the special committee on community life and structure of Maryville College recommended that an all-college council be organized. Following approval of this recommendation by the executive council of the faculty council members were chosen in a campuswide election. Six members from each group--students, faculty, and administration--were selected. The president, academic dean, and secretary of the faculty would be automatic members. In January 1969, the all-college council was installed as the chief deliberative and legislative body for Maryville College, responsible for long-range planning and for directing the activities of the entire college community, under the broad purposes and policies set forth by the board of directors. The three coordinating councils that supplement the council are responsible for activities in academic, religious, social, cultural, and recreational affairs. Smaller committees within the coordinating councils direct specific programs.

Brewster, Kingman, Jr. *The Report of the President. Yale University: 1967-68*. New Haven, Conn: Yale University, September 1968, (*Research in Education*, ED 034 497, MF - 25¢, HC - $2.05).

The governance of Yale University and the relationship of this institution to urban problems in New Haven are discussed within the framework of what the distinctive nature and central mission of a university should be. A section of the report analyzes the roles of Yale's faculty members, administrators, and students in its governmental structure. Five basic recommendations for increased participation by students and faculty as well as increased mutual respect among the three groups are presented.

Caffrey John, ed. *The Future Academic Community: Continuity and Change.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1969.

This book covers the proceedings of the American Council on Education. Many of the papers touch on or are related to the topic of student participation in governance, and several deal with it directly. C. Peter Magrath discusses confrontations over the student conduct rules and disciplinary proceedings at Brown-Pembroke University (Rhode Island) and the body created to deal with this area, the university council on student affairs, in an article entitled "Student Participation: What Happens When We Try It?"

Allan P. Sindler, in "A Case Study in Student-University Relations," reports on the work of a commission at Cornell (New York) which studied "the broad area of student affairs and conduct, law enforcement on campus, the interdependence of university regulations and local, State, and Federal law, and university procedures in all these areas."

Robert D. Clark details the changes at San Jose State College (California) following disturbances on campus. Among the changes were some related to increasing student participation in governance. "Several committees intended to increase student liaison with the faculty and administration were created; morever, students were seated on several important faculty committees and given voting membership on the academic council, the college's delegate legislative body."

Other authors comment more generally on the topic.

"Campus Government at Stanford," *Universities* 96, October 12, 1968, p. 330.

This is a report on a recommended new system for campus rulemaking and enforcement giving students greater responsibility in these areas at Stanford University (California). The plan came about as the result of a 3-day sit-in at the Old Student Union. Basically, the plan creates an 11-man student conduct legislative council and a nine-man judicial council. The faculty would retain the majority of seats on both.

Charter and By-Laws of the Spring Hill College Senate. Mobile, Alabama: Spring Hill College, 1969, (*Research in Education,* ED 035 366, MF - 25¢, HC - 55¢).

These documents outline the purposes, functions, and powers of the new Spring Hill college senate, which is composed of 13 faculty members and four students. In a letter accompanying these papers, the college's vice president wrote: "In general, our senate has worked remarkably well as a unifying factor between the student body, the faculty, and the administration. The senate has a great deal of authority over the functions of the academic and student personnel divisions of the college. It also has advisory power over other operations of the college. The fact that four students are on this body and meet regularly with it is significant in that it gives students a voice in the shaping of curricular and student personnel policies. Students have been among the most articulate members of the senate and have exercised a wholesome and worthwhile influence upon it."

The College Senate. By-Laws. Lancaster, Pa.: Franklin and Marshall College, November 26, 1969, (*Research in Education,* ED 034 506, MF - 25¢, HC - 30¢).

These bylaws, drafted by the faculty of Franklin and Marshall College, establish a college senate that will be responsible for "(1) the consideration and disposition of matters affecting the welfare of the college, and (2) preserving and advancing the well-being of the college as a whole." The senate will consist of 20 members: 12 regular and three at-large faculty members who will serve 3-year terms; three student representatives who will serve 1-year terms; and the president and dean of the college, who will serve as long as they hold those offices. The bylaws present a detailed explanation of how faculty and student members will be nominated and elected. The senate, which will be empowered to discuss, examine, and establish policies related to the academic life of the college, is granted most of the powers and prerogatives that now reside in the faulty as a whole. It would meet at least once a month with a quorum of 14 members required for the conduct of business. These meetings will be open to members of the college community, although the senate has the power to hold closed meetings. Senate decisions are to be regularly reported in writing to the faculty and also made known to the rest of the college community. Questions, proposals, or comments concerning the general welfare of the college may also be made during meetings of the full faculty, which are to be held at least once a semester.

"Constitution of the Yeshiva College Senate." New York, N.Y.: Yeshiva College, 1969, (*Research in Education,* ED 035 353, MF - 25¢, HC - 45¢).

According to the preamble to its new constitution, the Yeshiva College Senate will "share responsibility for the operations and improvement of the college among the groups that constitute the college." The senate is to be composed of five administrators, eight faculty members, six students, and one nonvoting alumnus. Article I details their selection, terms of office, and procedural matters. Article II delineates the senate's scope. It is to have jurisdiction over academic standards, admissions policy, curriculum, degree requirements, the establishment of new majors and courses, policy determination in the areas of standards of scholastic performance, student attendance, the grading system and academic honors, and disposition of all matters submitted to it by the administration, faculty, and student council. In addition, the senate will make policy recommendations on matters affecting faculty welfare including appointments, promotions, leaves of absence, honors, and remuneration. Article III outlines the appointment of two student members each to a number of committees. Article IV refers to constitutional amendments. An Appendix lists the functions of the senate committees.

"Final Report of the Antioch College Commission on Governance." Washington, D.C.: U.S. National Student Association, June 1968.

The report is concerned with four major topics: the formal governance structure and suggestions for its change, faculty personnel policies, the existing education program, and a model for its revision.

Foote, Caleb; Mayer, Henry; and others. *The Culture of the University: Governance and Education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1968.
This book is the complete official report of the faculty-student commission on university governance appointed in January 1967 by the Berkeley academic senate and the senate of associated students. Although the book is concerned with total university governance, it is especially concerned with increasing effective student participation. Governance is discussed primarily from the standpoint of the University of California, Berkeley campus. Chapter VI deals primarily with the rationale for student participation and gives specific consideration to the areas of education policymaking, conduct, and welfare services. General goals rather than specific recommendations are offered.

Governance Report. New York, N.Y.: Queens College, City University of New York, November 1969, (*Research in Education,* ED 035 358, MF - 25¢, HC - 55¢).
This paper, attacking "fundamental and important campus issues," grew out of the work of a committee of students, faculty, and administrators. It recommends creation of an academic senate to replace the faculty senate as the supreme legislative body of Queens College. The new body is to be composed of 54 tenured faculty, 18 nontenured faculty, and 36 students, as well as several *ex officio* nonvoting members. Rules governing meetings, selection of members, and elections are included. The senate is to have the power to determine policies, standards, programs, and goals of the college; safeguard academic freedom, advise and consent on the appointment of the president and all deans, recommend candidates for the presidency and deanships as vacancies occur; propose amendments and revisions to the bylaws of the board of higher education; and provide for the implementation of the foregoing powers. As of January 2, 1970, the report had been approved by the faculty council and the student body and was awaiting approval by the Queens College committee, the CUNY committee, and the CUNY board of higher education.

"Governing a College: Curriculum, Yes; Social life, No!" *College Management 4,* May, 1969, pp. 53-54.
This article discusses the students' participation in decisionmaking at Guilford College (North Carolina). Because of the religious nature of the institution (Quaker), students have made fewer inroads with respect to parietals than other areas of decisionmaking.

"Governing a College: A Unified Command," *College Management* 4, May 1969, pp. 48-49.
This article describes a new unicameral university senate adopted by the University of New Hampshire. The senate is composed of 30 fac-

ulty members, 30 undergraduates, 12 administrators, and 5 graduate students. Other features of the plan are also given.

"Governing a College: Whose Man Is the Chancellor?" *College Management* 4, May 1969, pp. 56-60.

This article describes an attempt by the trustees of Syracuse University (New York) to involve students and faculty in the process of selecting a new chancellor.

Jenks, R. Stephen. *The Student Role in Faculty Selection, Evaluation and Retention.* Washington, D.C.: National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, November 10, 1969, (*Research in Education,* ED 034 487, MF - 24¢, HC - 45¢).

Arguing that it is difficult to discuss the student's role in selection, evaluation, and retention outside the broader context of the student's role in decisionmaking as set forth in the new unicameral system (see Jenks, ED 034 500) the author describes the new government at the University of New Hampshire and some of the processes the institution went through in achieving the reorganization. The committee on government organization found that most institutions that had recently included students in the governance process had done so by adding students to existing decisionmaking bodies. It decided that merely adding students to the old university senate "would leave an already inefficient and unwieldy body even more so" and thus a complete restructuring was necessary. Two convocations and many open meetings were held to explain the details and purposes of the proposed changes before they were approved by a referendum, the president, and the board of trustees.

Jenks, R. Stephen, and others. *Report of the Committee on Government Organization.* Durham: University of New Hampshire, March 6, 1969, (*Research in Education,* ED 034 500, MF - 25¢, HC - 40¢).

This report presents in detail a unicameral government structure with supporting student and faculty caucuses, established at the University of New Hampshire by its committee on government organization to (1) provide maximum participation to all members of the university community on a fair and equitable basis, and (2) provide a more efficient structure than the existing one with its competing power groups. Particular attention was given to the student role. The proposed 77-member university senate comprises 30 undergraduate students, 30 faculty members, 12 administrators, and five graduate students. Its work is organized by an internal executive council that, among other things, serves the president of the university in an advisory capacity, prepares the agenda for senate meetings, recommends nominations to all senate committees, and takes actions on an interim basis between meetings and during vacation periods. The faculty and student caucuses are composed of senators representing faculty and undergraduate students respectively. Every year, each caucus selects a chairman from one of its members who serves on the executive council and presides at meetings of the respective caucuses. The purpose of the unicameral structure is to unite the university community by bringing together and promoting trust among students, faculty members, and administrators.

Knock, Gary H., and others. *The Report of the Commission on Student Participation in University Life.* Oxford, Ohio: Miami University, September 1969, (*Research in Education,* ED 034 499. MF -25¢, HC - $1.90).

The commission on student participation in university life at Miami University carefully examined many dimensions of student life and university affairs wtih the objective of providing a framework within which a student may accept greater responsibility for the consequences of his behavior and for planning his own future. In this statement, the commission presents the basis for its investigation, offers a rationale for student participation in university life, and considers how such participation may be accomplished within the structure of Miami University. The discussion is presented with the commission's recommendations under 10 major headings: university governance, academic activities, student advising, commuting students, black students, women students, residential activities, and extracurricular activities. Emphasis is placed on student involvement in policymaking. Separate recommendations and six appendixes containing papers dealing with other subjects related to student participation in university life accompany the report.

Meehan, Mary, ed. *Role and Structure of Student Government.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. National Student Association, 1966.

This book is intended as a reference manual for students dealing with the *why* and *how* of student government. The first part consists of a series of readings on the theoretical role of student government; the second part presents a comprehensive picture of student government structures. The appendixes contain sample constitutions.

"A Statement of Principles and Pragmatics," a platform presented during spring 1965 student government elections at City College of New York, is concerned with reforms intended to increase student participation in decisionmaking, as well as other topics.

"Student Representation in Campus Government," by Mary Meehan, examines the advantages and disadvantages of three major forms of student representation in campus government: through student government, cooperative government or extensive representation on faculty and administrative committees, and community government.

"Community Government at Reed College," by Charles Goldmark and others is a case study describing student involvement in a new governance structure.

James E. Boren's "Cooperative Government at the University of Minnesota" is annotated in document 15-B.

Morison, Robert S. *The President's Commission on Student Involvement in Decision Making. The Chairman's Report.* Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University, June 11, 1969, (*Research in Education,* ED 034 501, MF - 50¢, HC - $5.05).

This report is based on the premise that the principal functions of the modern university are teaching, research, and public service. The first section of the report briefly reviews these three functions and discusses: (1) the development of the relationship between the university and society, particularly as this development has occurred in the United States; (2) the complex nature of university administration; and (3) reasons underlying student discontent and how they are related to the quality of a student's life as a member of the university community, to the quality of his educational experience, and to his relationship to the university as a concerned citizen. The second section of the report recommends administrative changes that could be undertaken for the redistribution of power both within the existing framework of Cornell University and at other universities. This discussion covers Cornell's academic and educational environments as they relate to student development; the need for a new administrative device for dealing with major policy issues; and fundamental issues concerning the university's relationship to U.S. national policy. A paper submitted by Ian Macneil (see document 15-C) comments on this report.

A Progress Report by The Committee on University Governance. Boca Raton: Florida Atlantic University, May 6, 1969, (*Research in Education,* ED 034 504, MF - 25¢, HC - 50¢).

Based on its conclusion that a unicameral senate would be both desirable and feasible, Florida Atlantic University's committee on university governance drafted a proposal to establish a "single universitywide senate, which truly represents administration, faculty, and students." The two parts of the proposal present (1) the composition of the senate membership and procedures for selecting members; and (2) the composition and number of senate committees. This report discusses both parts in detail. The proposed 139-member senate would include 70 faculty members, 48 students, and 21 administrative officers, all of whom would serve 1-year terms. Fifty faculty members would be elected from each of eight colleges in the fall of each year; the three student officers and 21 student members-at-large would be elected in yearly spring elections. No election procedure would be required for the administrative officers, all of whom would be *ex officio* members. Senate committee members would serve 1-year terms on 11 committees that would deal with the following matters: university budget; steering and policy; promotion, tenure and honorary degrees; academic freedom and due process; admissions and petitions; curriculum; research; library; publications; physical space; and cultural affairs and activities.

A Proposal to Establish The Council of the Princeton University Community. A Report of the Special Committee on the Structure of the University. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University, May 1969, (*Reserach in Education,* ED 034 487, MF - 25¢, HC - $1.80).

To effect a system of university governance in which a broad range of opinion may be brought to bear on policy issues and in which differences of opinion within and among groups may be heard, Princeton University's special committee on the structure of the university has proposed the establishment of the council of the Princeton University community. The proposed council would have the authority to "consider and investigate any question of university policy, any aspect of the governing of the university, and any general issue related to the welfare of the university." Part I presents the basic features of the council, and states how it may be expected to operate in practice and how it would fit into Princeton's governmental structure. Part II contains the charter of the council, which describes the authority, membership, organization, and procedures of the proposed council. The 57 council members would include representatives of the faculty, administration, undergraduate and graduate students, alumni, the staff council, and the professional library, research, technical, and office staffs. The president of Princeton University would be the council's presiding officer and chairman of its 15-member executive committee. The charter provides for six standing committees: on governance, rights and rules, priorities, relations with the local community, resources, and judicial matters.

Proposed Constitution for a University Senate of Morehead State University. Recommendations of the Special Committee on University Government. Morehead, Ky.: Morehead State University, May 20, 1969, (*Research in Education,* ED 035 359, MF - 25¢, HC - 35¢).

This proposed constitution for a university senate was approved by the faculty of Morehead State University in May 1969, and by the board of regents in June 1969. The senate's duties are to act as an advisory body in developing institutional policies; a liaison among various elements in the university and between those elements and the board regents; a deliberative body on any issue that might arise; and a coordinator of the work of university committees. Students are voting members of the new senate. Rules governing their election are included.

Recommendations for the Governance of Wesleyan University. Middletown, Conn.. Wesleyan University, September, 1969, (*Research in Education,* ED 035 356, MF - 25¢, HC - $1.15).

This report deals mainly with new responsibilities and procedures for Wesleyan's board of trustees. Two of the essential goals of the reorganization were to engage faculty and students in the decision-making processes of the board through voting memberships on committees, and to enable them to participate in open board meeting discussions of recommendations they or others helped to formulate. Recommendations are offered.

Report of the University of Minnesota Task Force on Student Representation. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, January 2, 1969, (*Research in Education,* ED 028 707, MF - 25¢, HC - 85¢).

The task force on student representation recommends that a step be taken toward a true university senate by incorporating students as full participants in the senate and assemblies as well as increasing their membership in senate and assembly committees. Specific recommendations are made concerning implementation. Students are specifically excluded from the university committee on tenure and the senate judicial committee.

Revised Report of the Committee on University Governance. The Executive Committee of the Committee on University Governance. Binghampton: State University of New York, March 14, 1969, (*Research in Education,* ED 028 736, MF - 25¢, HC - $1.35).

The committee on university governance--composed of elected undergraduates, graduate students, faculty and administrators--was established to investigate the university's system of governance and to recommend changes necessary for instituting a system of community governance. The report presents a new form of governance in which authority and responsibility in decisionmaking are shared by students, faculty and administrators. Section I details the structure of college, graduate school, and university assemblies. Sections II to V cover educational policies, admissions, university personnel policy and procedures, and social regulations. Section VI recommends an integrated judicial system composed of four levels of boards, and specifies their areas of jurisdiction. Sections VII to IX discuss the rights and obligations of faculty, students, and administrators; amendment procedures for changing the overall structure of university governance; and implementation of the proposals in the report.

Schwartz, Edward, ed. *Student Power* (See document 15-E)

Second Interim Report to the Trustees of Columbia University. New York, N.Y.: Columbia University, March 17, 1969, (*Research in Education*, ED 029 586, MF - 25¢, HC - 45¢).

The subject of this report is student participation in the governance of Columbia University. The committee proposed that: a university senate including student members be established to replace the present university council and advisory committee of the faculties to the president; the trustees establish procedures for consultation with the senate on certain matters such as selection of the president; and the opportunities for meaningful participation in university affairs at the school, faculty, and departmental level be fostered. (See *Third Interim Report*, document 15-F.)

Senate Code. Lawrence: University of Kansas, December 20, 1969, (*Research in Education*, ED 034 507, MF - 25¢, HC - 85¢).

This code outlines the structure and functions of the new university senate which is composed of the chancellor, provosts and vice chancellor, members of the faculty senate, and members of the student senate. Students are represented on the university council, senate executive committee, faculty and student executive committees, and on the standing committees of the senate and university boards.

Smith, Thomas A. "The Trinity College Council...Experiment in Collegiality," *Trinity Alumni Magazine* 10, Summer 1969, pp. 18-22, 47-49.

This article describes the first year of the Trinity College council, a group of four students, four faculty members and four administrators formed to advise the president on nonacademic issues of concern to the college and to make recommendations for action. It discusses the work of the council in establishing a collegewide set of regulatory procedures, instituting rules governing the confidentiality of records, participating in long-range institutional planning, recommending admission of students to the board of trustees, studying drug abuse on campus, revising parietal rules, and examining the issue of Air Force ROTC and winning renegotiation of the contract with the Air Force.

Splete, Allen P. *An Interim Report on Student Representation in the Academic Community at Syracuse University.* Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University, May 1969, (*Research in Education,* ED 035 367, MF - 25¢, HC - 95¢).

This report documents and describes the substantial student representation at the all-university, college or school, and departmental levels of Syracuse University. It notes that 25 students are members of six major policymaking committees, that 17 graduate and 28 undergraduate students became members of the university senate in fall 1969, and that 11 students were members of the 33-member selection committee for a new chancellor. The bylaws of the senate as amended on December 17, 1969, are included. They describe the senate's membership and the functions of its committees.

The Study of Education at Stanford. Report to the University. "Government of the University." Palo Alto, Calif.: Stanford University, February 1969, (*Research in Education,* ED 032 851, MF -50¢, HC - Not available from EDRS).

This report focuses on those aspects of governance for which specific changes might afford some promise of marked administrative improvement. Recommendations cover the responsibilities of the board of trustees, the roles of the president and other principal administrative officers, school and departmental administrators, university-wide faculty committees, and student participation in faculty committees.

Noting that academic power rests primarily with the faculty and that power is exercised through the work of committees, the committee recommends student membership on faculty committees as the most effective way to secure greater student involvement in academic decision-making. It also recommends student membership on committees of the board of trustees and nonvoting student membership in the senate.

Third Interim Report to the Trustees of Columbia University. New York, N.Y.: Columbia University, May 12, 1969, (*Research in Education,* ED 028 751, MF - 25¢, HC - 95¢).

The special committee evaluated an executive commitee's proposal to establish a representative university senate and recommended its adoption (see *Second Interim Report,* document 15-F). This plan had earlier been approved by the vote of almost 44 percent of the faculty and student body. Resolutions amending the bylaws and statutes are included. The election, eligibility, recall, and terms of office of faculty, students, administrators, and other representatives, and responsibilities and powers of the senate are covered.

Twenty-one of the 101-member senate would be students. The special committee recommended that the deans of Columbia College and graduate faculties also be included in the senate membership and clarified the role of the trustees. The senate would be a policymaking body which would consider all matters of universitywide concern.

PREP

NO. 15-G

RECENT CHANGES IN GOVERNANCE

The literature makes clear that there is a large body of sympathetic opinion among educators on the issue of student participation in university governance. Throughout the country, moreover, institutions are moving to translate paper proposals into reality.

This document records many of the changes in governance processes which have been proposed or have actually taken place in the past 2 years. The items were collected from newspapers (mainly the *New York Times, Washington Post,* and *Wall Street Journal*), magazines, newsletters, and press releases from national higher education associations and the colleges and universities themselves.

The items are divided into three groups. The first and largest deals with the addition of students to existing administrative bodies, such as university senates, faculty senates, boards of trustees, and committees.

The second group contains examples of the creation or proposed creation of new policymaking bodies on which students are represented. Some of these committees were formed to serve specific purposes, and thus are only temporary in nature. These include search committees for new presidents or deans, task forces on community relations and responsibilities, and institutional self-study commissions. Others, however, are intended to be permanent and have been integrated with the existing governance structure.

The third group consists of examples of totally new systems of college or university government which give students a substantially greater role in decisionmaking than they previously had. These changes include, for the most part, the formation of bicameral or unicameral governing bodies. Many of the reports describing these proposed, new, or soon to be ratified structures are annotated in document 15-F.

National Center for Educational Communication/ OFFICE OF EDUCATION

I. ADDITION OF STUDENTS TO EXISTING BODIES

ALABAMA

University of Alabama (University)
Students are included on standing committees of the university, and student government leaders consulted about new administrative appointments. The entire student body also evaluates professors and courses for publication in the faculty-course evaluation newspaper.

University of South Alabama (Mobile)
Undergraduate and graduate students serve on committees advising the dean of the College of Education.

ARKANSAS

Southern State College (Magnolia)
The student senate president was given a permanent, nonvoting seat on the board of trustees. Student senate officers may address the board and place items on its agenda.

State College of Arkansas (State College)
Students serve on the college discipline committee which rules on breaches of conduct and violation of college rules.

University of Arkansas (Fayetteville)
Students are represented on all faculty-administrative committees and each committee of the university senate.

CALIFORNIA

Humboldt State College (Arcata)
Students were given voting representation on all major administrative bodies including the president's council, the faculty academic senate, and the college foundation. Students had previously gained representation on most major faculty committees.

San Jose State College (San Jose)
Students have been seated on several important faculty committees and given voting membership on the academic council, the college's legislative body (see Caffrey, document 15-F).

Stanford University (Stanford, Palo Alto)
The Stanford chapter of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) recommended changes that would increase student participation in university policymaking (see *The Study of....*, document 15-F). Stanford trustees invite students and faculty members to serve as voting members on most board of trustee committees, although they will not be given actual membership on the board.

University of Redlands (Redlands)
The faculty senate voted to add students as voting members to committees on curriculum, personnel, foreign programs and honors.

CONNECTICUT

Silvermine College of Art (New Canaan)
Students helped to choose new members of the board of trustees, two of whom were students.

University of Connecticut (Storrs)
The governor of Connecticut named a student to the board of trustees to fill the unexpired term of a board member who resigned.

Yale University (New Haven)
The faculty voted to add six students each to two top faculty standing committees--the executive committee and the course of study committee. The students have full voting privileges. The executive committee is concerned with rules governing student life, and the course of study committee deals with curricular matters. *The Report of the President* (see Brewster, document 15-F) calls for increased student participation in Yale's governance.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

American University
For the first time, 12 students have been admitted to the university senate with full rights of participation. In addition, 3 students have become nonvoting participants at board of trustees' meetings.

Catholic University
During the past 2 years, students have been added to all major committees, except the president's council and the chief advisory group on administrative and academic matters.

George Washington University
The board of trustees approved a resolution to invite to future meetings, as a guest, the president of the student government.

Howard University
The trustees agreed to include student and faculty representatives on their board and appointed a committee to work with the faculty senate and the student association to draw up a detailed plan. A bill describing the committee's proposal was introduced on May 12, 1969. The board would be reduced from 24 to 15 trustees, with eight members appointed by the President of the United States, two elected by tenured faculty, three elected by alumni, and two elected by students. Students would have to be in their final year of undergraduate or graduate study in order to qualify. The colleges and professional schools have been directed by the university's president to draft plans for student voting representation in faculty organizations and committees. Within the School of Engineering and Architecture, student represent-

atives from five departments attend faculty meetings, except for those on personnel matters. Each department now has a student activities committee to study student grievances. At the School of Law, a student-faculty committee discussed student participation at future faculty meetings. Most of the school's committees now have equal student representation, except for those concerned with faculty appointments, promotions and reappointments. The School of Social Work has included student members on most of its committees.

GEORGIA

Columbus College (Columbus)

Two students will serve on the admissions policy committee.

Valdosta State College (Valdosta)

Students have been admitted to membership on the academic council.

IDAHO

University of Idaho (Moscow)

The College of Medicine faculty has added student members chosen by election to the faculty standing committees on instruction, student appraisal, and student promotions.

INDIANA

Indiana State University (Terre Haute)

The student government president and vice president, as well as the editor of the student newspaper, attend meetings of the board of trustees.

Purdue University (Lafayette)

Five students were accepted as members with full voting rights to the student affairs committee of the university senate. The new members, of whom at least one must be a woman, includes four undergraduates and one graduate student.

IOWA

Drake University (Des Moines)

Ten students are members of the 70-member university senate which recommends policies for university operation. Students are also represented on 18 of the standing committees of the university senate.

University of Iowa (Iowa city)

Students work on more than half of the 21 policymaking committees of the university.

Upper Iowa College (Fayette)

Two students have been added, with full voting privileges, to the college's executive committee, which formulates policy, exercises administrative control, and determines budgetary matters.

KANSAS

Kansas State Teachers College (Emporia)

Voting students were added to the faculty senate committees; previously, student representatives attended faculty meetings without voting privileges. Some joint committees between the student and faculty senates are in operation, while others are being planned. Students serve on the college's long-range planning committee and its community relations committee.

KENTUCKY

Berea College (Berea)

The faculty voted to add students as voting members to most faculty committees. These representatives are selected by the student government association.

Eastern Kentucky University (Richmond)

Students serve as voting members of all but two administrative and academic committees. The exceptions are the student disciplinary board and the board of regents, which have nonvoting student members. The latter nonvoting position of the board of regents is the result of a new State law. (See University of Kentucky for details of selection procedure.)

University of Kentucky (Lexington)

A State law passed in April 1968 provides for student membership on the boards of trustees of six State-supported institutions, including the University of Kentucky. The student government president for each of these institutions serves as a nonvoting member of the board, attends all meetings, and is eligible for committee appointments. The student member must be a Kentucky resident. The law provides for the selection of another student if the president of the student body should be an out-of-State student. The law was implemented at the University of Kentucky in May 1969.

LOUISIANA

Louisiana State University (Baton Rouge)

Students were appointed to college course and curriculum committees.

MAINE

Colby College (Waterville)

A constitutional convention composed of students, faculty, administrators, alumni, trustees and parents recommended (1) making two students nonvoting members of the board of trustees and voting members of all committees of the board; (2) making two students, selected by the student government, voting members at all faculty meetings and adding students as voting members of college committees; (3) requiring each department to establish a procedure for joint student-faculty planning.

of the curriculum and major programs; and (4) forming a committee of undergraduate majors to join each department in recommending the dismissal, retention, or promotion of faculty members.

University of Maine (Orono)
The governor of Maine has named a student to a 3-year term on the board of trustees.

Maryland

St. Mary's College (St. Mary's City)
Two nonvoting students have been placed on every college committee, as well as on the board of trustees.

Towson State College (Baltimore)
The president and vice president of the student body are voting members of the college senate.

Massachusetts

Boston College (Chestnut Hill)
A small number of students have been seated on the faculty senate.

College of the Holy Cross (Worcester)
The faculty voted to give students 12 percent of the votes in faculty meetings and a committee voice in hiring, dismissing, promoting, and recommending tenure of the faculty.

State College of Westfield (Westfield)
Student representatives were added to three standing committees dealing with executive matters, curriculum, and disciplinary affairs.

MICHIGAN

Michigan State University (East Lansing)
The faculty of the department of sociology voted to include undergraduate and graduate students as voting members on the committee which determines such matters as faculty hiring, firing, promotion, and tenure. An amendment provides that there will also be student representatives on all departmental standing committees.

MINNESOTA

University of Minnesota (Minneapolis)
A task force on student representation has recommended that students become members of the university senate and its committees (see Boren, document 15-B; *Report,* document 15-F).

MISSOURI

University of Missouri (Columbia)
Student representation has been increased on all campuswide commit-

tees. Students have also been added to university committees dealing with student conduct, as well as several faculty committees.

University of Missouri (Kansas City)

Five students have been given full voting rights and committee privileges in the faculty senate. This change affects the campuses of the Missouri State system at Columbia, Rolla, St. Louis, and Kansas City.

MONTANA

Eastern Montana College (Billings)

Student representation was increased on faculty and administrative committees.

Northern Montana College (Havre)

Student representation is being increased on faculty and administrative committees.

NEBRASKA

University of Nebraska (Lincoln)

Three students are included on a nine-member curriculum committee of the College of Arts and Sciences.

NEW JERSEY

Princeton University (Princeton)

Juniors and seniors have elected a senior student to the board of trustees for a 4-year term.

NEW MEXICO

New Mexico State University (University Park)

Since 1968, two students have served on each of the faculty senate's 16 committees.

NEW YORK

Colgate University (Hamilton)

Students and faculty members have been seated on many trustee committees.

New York University (New York)

One student representative from each undergraduate and graduate division of the university was included in the university senate. Composition of the senate is now 14 deans, 10 appointees of the university president, 24 elected faculty members, and 16 students. Students are included on each committee of the senate.

State University of New York (Genesco)
Students have a voice in hiring faculty and deciding on curricular matters.

Syracuse University (Syracuse)
Student representation on the university senate was expanded from one to 45 members (see document 15-F).

OHIO

Antioch College (Yellow Springs)
A commission on governance recommended placement of five faculty members and five students on the board of trustees for 3-year terms.

Cleveland State University (Cleveland)
The self-governing powers of students have been increased in a bill of rights adopted by the board of trustees. Students became members of university committees and participants at departmental meetings (see Benovich, document 15-F).

Oberlin College (Oberlin)
Many "important" changes resulted from the participation of two students on the faculty educational policy committee.

Ohio University (Athens)
Students serve as members of 38 university committees, including the executive and priorities planning committees of the university.

University of Toledo (Toledo)
Students are present at meetings of the board of trustees, but may not vote.

PENNSYLVANIA

Haverford College (Haverford)
Two students, selected by the student association, serve on the board of managers. Decisions are made by consensus and not by vote in this body. The students do not have the right to prevent consensus on final decisions. Nine other students attend faculty meetings.

Lehigh University (Bethlehem)
An ad hoc committee was formed by the board of trustees to investigate the feasibility of seating two student representatives on the board.

Millersville State College (Millersville)
Students now participate in meetings of the faculty senate and are elected as official senate advisers.

Shippensburg State College (Shippensburg)
Students were added to the curriculum committee.

University of Pittsburgh (Pittsburgh)
Students gained voting seats on student affairs, athletics, academic freedom and tenure, and budget policy committees.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Coker College (Hartsville)
A student and professor have become voting members of the board of trustees.

TENNESSEE

Vanderbilt University (Nashville)
Four students have become members of the board of trustees.

VERMONT

Marlboro College (Marlboro)
Students were added to all policymaking committees of the faculty. In spring 1969, the board of trustees permitted nonvoting delegates from the faculty and student body to particpate in their discussions.

VIRGIN ISLANDS

College of the Virgin Islands (St. Thomas)
Students are now voting members of the administrative council and almost all standing committees.

VIRGINIA

Radford College (Radford)
Students were added to nine faculty committees.

Randolph-Macon College (Lynchburg)
The faculty voted to allow students to become full members of five faculty committees, including the curriculum committee.

Mary Washington College (Charlottesville)
Students will have representation on four standing committees of the faculty not previously open to students. These committees deal with academic counseling and guidance, instruction and academic affairs, curriculum, and library matters.

WISCONSIN

University of Wisconsin (Madison)
The president of the student association has been given a voting seat on the city-university coordination committee. Students also advise on faculty qualifications and courses. *The Crow Report* (see Schwartz, ed., document 15-E; Ad Hoc Committee, document 15-F) calls for increased student voting membership on all university committees.

II. FORMATION OF NEW COMMITTEES

CALIFORNIA

Pomona College (Claremont)
An organization of professors and students called F.A.S.T. (Faculty and Students Together) won acceptance from the faculty and trustees for the establishment of a Black Studies Center.

San Jose State College (San Jose)
Several committees to increase student liaison with the faculty and administration have been created.

CONNECTICUT

Eastern Connecticut State College (Willimantic)
A major revision in undergraduate course requirements in liberal arts and teacher education programs was suggested by the curriculum revision committee of which students were members. The proposal was adopted.

Southern Connecticut State College (New Haven)
Along with three other State colleges, Southern Connecticut has formed a student advisory council to the board of trustees of State College which will meet with the board at least once a month.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

George Washington University
The university senate approved a temporary student court to try students accused of breaking university regulations. It will remain in existence until June 1970, or when a permanent student judiciary is created. The court consists of a faculty adviser and five students appointed by the president of the student assembly and approved by the assembly and the president.

Georgetown University
Students are serving on a search committee to find a new university president.

Howard University
Within the College of Pharmacy a student-faculty judiciary has been established consisting of four students, four faculty, and headed by a student chairman. A faculty-student committee has been established at the College of Medicine to handle student-faculty relationships.

GEORGIA

Georgia Institute of Technology (Atlanta)
Students had a voice in selecting a new president.

ILLINOIS

Northern Illinois University (DeKalb)
Students helped establish a new judicial system and participate in its administration.

Northwestern University (Evanston)
A student-alumni-faculty committee has been appointed to advise the board of trustees on the appointment of a new president.

Southern Illinois University (Carbondale)
Student advisory groups meet with each school or college to discuss academic programs, curriculum, student relations, and faculty matters.

IOWA

Drake University (Des Moines)
Students are represented on two ad hoc committees of the university senate--one to select a new dean of the journalism department and a new vice president of student life, and the other to plan a new health center.

University of Iowa (Iowa City)
The vice president for student affairs has appointed a committee of students to advise him on matters of governance. The state board of regents invited a committee of four students to assist faculty and alumni in choosing a new president.

KANSAS

Kansas State University (Manhattan)
Students in the department of political science have a student committee composed of six voting delegates, a moderator and three publicity officers to participate in faculty meetings, help evaluate prospective faculty members, and conduct an evaluation of the faculty and curriculum. The faculty senate opens its meetings to all who wish to attend.

MASSACHUSETTS

Harvard University (Cambridge)
Harvard and Radcliffe formed a policy committee composed of students, faculty and administrators to deal with educational issues. The faculty passed a resolution establishing an executive committee to establish a new department for Black Studies, consisting of four faculty members, two students elected by the association and two elected representatives of students majoring in the field. It has the power to draw up a curriculum for the department and choose faculty members. The Harvard board of overseers has established a committee composed of 11 students, 18 faculty members, three administrators, one alumnus, and one Harvard fellow to plan for changes in Harvard's structure. This 34-member committee will "identify the most important issues and recommend optimum structures and methods for considering them." It has been divided into three subcommittees to consider faculty benefits, community relations, research policy, discipline, and cooperation with other institutions. A special committee of the faculty of arts and sciences recommended

that students be given formal, though indirect power in the formulation of faculty policy. Four student-faculty committees proposed legislation to the full faculty covering undergraduate life, university-community relations, and undergraduate and graduate education. The faculty of arts and science approved a new panel to handle student discipline. The committee on rights and responsibilities is composed of six professors and three undergraduates.

MICHIGAN

Michigan State University (East Lansing)
An ad hoc committee on student participation in academic affairs composed of eight faculty and five students has been established. Students of Justin Morrill and James Madison Colleges take an active part in planning their own curriculum and regulations.

MISSOURI

Maryville College of Sacred Heart (St. Louis)
The students have organized their own curriculum committee.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Plymouth State College (Plymouth)
A joint student-faculty-administration advisory group on disruption was organized to analyze campus tensions, with a view toward their prevention through student participation in college governance.

NEW YORK

Columbia University (New York)
The trustees gave students and faculty members a voice in choosing a new president. Columbia students and faculty members elected separate committees for the search, but conducted joint meetings. The School of General Studies has established a student-faculty commission to redefine the schools's structure, curriculum, and enrollment policies.

Cornell University (Ithaca)
The university commission on the interdependence of university regulations and local, State and Federal law, composed of four students, three faculty members, and six administrators, presented principles for a student conduct code and enforcement of a revised adjudicative system, as well as policy proposals on other problem areas (see Caffrey, document 15-F). A five member review board made up of students, faculty and administrators was created as the court of last resort (see Morison, document 15-F).

Hartwick College (Oneonta)
Students are serving on a search committee to find a new president.

New York University (New York)
The School of Education has appointed a student committee to review its program offerings.

State University of New York (Albany)

The chancellor's student advisory cabinet, composed of 22 student association presidents of the State-operator campuses of New York and the student presidents of four representative community colleges, was formed. The cabinet meets two or three times each year with the chancellor and representatives from the central administrative staff to discuss issues, policies, and other matters of university-wide concern. "The cabinet is not a governance body in the formal sense that it takes action on items under consideration, but rather provides the opportunity for open discussion and improved community within a large and complex university."

State University of New York (Genesco)

Students and faculty members have equal representation on the college community council.

State University of New York (New Paltz)

Student evaluation of classroom teaching is considered in decisions on nontenured faculty retention. Students form a committee paralleling the college's faculty committee on tenure and promotion, and report directly to the president on the classroom performance of teachers.

NORTH CAROLINA

Davidson College (Davidson)

Students served on search committees to find a new president.

OHIO

Antioch College (Yellow Springs)

A commission on goverance recommended that (a) five students and five faculty members serve for 2-year terms on a new Antioch College council that would retain the powers of the administrative council; (b) an education council be formed composed of 16 students and 16 faculty members elected at large for 2-year terms; (c) the dean of faculty be responsible for developing and legislating educational policies and programs.

Ohio University (Athens)

Six special task forces composed of faculty, students, and administrators review and assess the program and operations of the university, including academic goals and priorities, student life, budget goals and procedures, resources, services, and facilities. A president's advisory council including faculty, student, and administrative representatives has been created.

PENNSYLVANIA

Bucknell University (Lewisburg)
A joint student-faculty-administration committee was formed to discuss and make recommendations about changes in student participation.

Temple University (Philadelphia)
A student subcommittee of the university's educational programs and policy committee was created.

University of Pennsylvania (Philadelphia)
In addition to forming their own curriculum committee, students have joined with faculty and administrative representatives to discuss and make recommendations concerning changes in student participation in governance.

RHODE ISLAND

Brown University and Pembroke College (Providence)
Students were included on committees to study such things as dormitory and food service arrangements and the bookstore. The advisory committee on student conduct--composed of two undergraduates and one graduate student, three administrative, and three faculty members--made 28 recommendations which were endorsed by the administration, faculty, students and trustees. They proposed new substantive rules and structural arrangements for making and enforcing future student conduct rules. A university council on student affairs--composed of three administrators, three faculty and six students--was created to propose rules and handle student conduct questions. The first year of implementation was 1967-68 (see Caffrey, document 15-F).

TENNESSEE

Austin Peay University (Clarksville)
A student tribunal, composed of elected and appointed students, serves as the principal judiciary body in student discipline cases with authority to hear and rule on any case involving an infraction of the university's regulations.

TEXAS

University of Houston (Houston)
The student body president serves on an advisory committee to select a new vice president and dean of faculties.

University of Texas (Austin)
The faculty proposed student representation on committees for the selection of the president, vice presidents, deans, and department chairmen.

Western Texas State University (Canyon)
A committee of faculty, administrators, and students was formed to determine student views on current issues.

UTAH

University of Utah (Salt Lake City)
Student advisory committees in each of the university's approximately 70 departments make recommendations on tenure and retention, and particularly consider student opinion on an individual's teaching ability. These committees have also participated in curriculum reviews, initial appointments, and promotions. A council of 20--composed of student leaders, administrators, and faculty members--was formed to consider critical campus issues.

VIRGIN ISLANDS

College of the Virgin Islands (St. Thomas)
A special conference group has been organized to advise the board of trustees. Four students are elected annually to this group, serving with faculty and staff.

VIRGINIA

Radford College (Radford)
A 60-member student advisory board was created to be kept informed of the college's policies and offer opinions. The student legislature decides upon the composition of the committee.

WASHINGTON

Evergreen State College (Olympia)
Students from other universities and colleges were hired to serve with experienced administrators on a planning committee to advise on all aspects of the new college due to open in 1971.

WISCONSIN

University of Wisconsin (Madison)
A joint student-faculty committee was formed to examine the "teaching situation."

III. NEW GOVERNANCE STRUCTURES

ALABAMA

Spring Hill College (Mobile)
A college senate incorporating students was established with broad authority over academic policies and student personnel services (see *Charter*, document 15-F).

CALIFORNIA

Stanford University (Stanford, Palo Alto)
A new system for campus rule-making and enforcing, giving students greater responsibility, was instituted. It includes an 11-man (six faculty members and five students) student conduct legislative council to enact rules, and a nine-man (five faculty members and four students) judicial council to have jurisdiction over all student disciplinary cases (see "Campus Government," document 15-F; *The Study*, document 15-F).

University of California (Berkeley)
A task force composed of three student body presidents, three chancellors, and three faculty released its report on student participation in campus governance on December 29, 1969.

CONNECTICUT

Trinity College (Hartford)
The president established the Trinity College council, an advisory body composed of four students, four faculty members, and four administrators (see Smith, document 15-F). A new adjudicative structure was proposed.

University of Connecticut (Storrs)
The president recommended formation of a unicameral government (see Babbidge, document 15-F).

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

George Washington University
The board of trustees agreed to establish a "broadly representative commission" to determine if changes should be made in the university's government. The trustees acted on a proposal of the president which recommended that the commission include faculty, students, alumni, trustees, and friends of the university. The president charged the commission with examining "responsibility, authority, and decision-making in the university."

FLORIDA

Florida Atlantic University (Boca Raton)
Faculty and student senates agreed to dissolve their separate govern-

ment (see *A Progress Report,* document 15-F).

GEORGIA

University of Georgia (Athens)
Students are in charge of all general disciplinary action.

ILLINOIS

Kendall College (Evanston)
Kendall formed a college council composed of seven faculty members, seven administrators and seven students. Its authority is second only to the board of trustees, and its responsibilities are to "shape the educational, communal, and operational policies of Kendall." Students were largely responsible for the adoption of the council.

KANSAS

University of Kansas (Lawrence)
A university senate including students was formed (see *Senate* Code document 15-F). There is substantial student membership on all senate committees.

KENTUCKY

Morehead State University (Morehead)
A university senate including 12 students, 12 administrators and 25 faculty members was formed (see *Proposed Constitution,* document 15-F).

MASSACHUSETTS

Mount Holyoke College (South Hadley)
In *The Case for Participation* students make proposals for completely restructuring the college.

MINNESOTA

University of Minnesota (Minneapolis)
Students have become members of the university senate and its committees (see *Report,* document 15-F).

NEW HAMPSHIRE

University of New Hampshire (Durham)
A unicameral system of governance was established (see "Governing a College," document 15-F; Jenks, document 15-F).

NEW JERSEY

Princeton University (Princeton)
The special committee on the structure of the university proposed the creation of a council of the Princeton University community, composed of undergraduates, graduate students, and other units of the academic community (see *A Proposal...,* document 15-F).

NEW JERSEY

Princeton University (Princeton)
The special committee on the structure of the university proposed the creation of a council of the Princeton University community, composed of undergraduates, graduate students, and other units of the academic community (see *A Proposal...,* document 15-F).

NEW YORK

Columbia University (New York)
A special committee of the trustees evaluated the executive committee's proposal for a university senate and submitted appropriate resolutions amending the bylaws and statutes to implement recommendations. The senate would have 21 of 101 student members and would be a policymaking body to consider all matters of universitywide concern, thus avoiding questions of tenure. Members of the senate would be elected by at least 40 percent of their constituencies.

Queens College (New York)
A governance report was compiled by the ad hoc faculty-student committee on college government (see *Governance Report,* document 15-F).

State University of New York at Binghampton
A policymaking university assembly with a ratio of five faculty to three students to two administrators was established (see *Revised Report,* document 15-F).

State University of New York (Old Westbury)
Students participated in planning and running the new college (see Wofford, document 15-F).

Yeshiva University (New York)
A university senate was established. Its membership is comprised of six students, five administrators, and seven faculty members (see "Constitution," document 15-F).

NORTH CAROLINA

Duke University (Durham)
Following recommendations by the student-faculty-administration council, a committee including trustees, faculty, and students was established to examine university governance.

OHIO

Miami University (Oxford)
The commission on student participation in university life has proposed the creation of a new government structure (see Knock, document 15-F).

PENNSYLVANIA

Dickinson College (Carlisle)
A committee on campus governance, comprised of eight faculty members and eight students, is developing a resolution for a new governmental structure at Dickinson. Bicameral and unicameral legislative forms are being considered.

Franklin and Marshall College (Lancaster)
A new college senate was established which replaced the faculty senate which includes three students (see *The College*, document 15-F).

Mansfield State College (Mansfield)
A college judiciary, consisting of three courts, has been established.

TENNESSEE

Maryville College (Maryville)
An all-college council was established (see Blair, document 15-C).

TEXAS

Southern Methodist University (Dallas)
A "Tentative Governance Plan" was published. "This governance proposal seeks to insure the significant involvement of students in decisionmaking in both the formal and informal life of learning." It recommends establishment of a university academic council composed of 12 students, and six administrators to deal with extracurricular affairs.